

328094

JPRS-TAC-86-080

6 OCTOBER 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

19990422 105

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

A06
106P
9

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

6 OCTOBER 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR Space Research Institute Head on SDI, Moratorium (Moscow TASS, 12 Sep 86).....	1
Soviet Colonel: U.S. Rejects Compromise on SDI (V. Chernyshov; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 9 Sep 86)....	2
Soviet Chief of Staff on 'Proper Reply to SDI' (Sergey Akhromeyev; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 35, 8 Sep 86)..	5
USSR: Challenger Tragedy Shows Dangers of SDI (V. Golubkov; Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 26 Aug 86).....	7
TASS Reports on Delta-Satellite SDI Test (Moscow TASS, 5 Sep 86).....	9
Pentagon Confirmation	9
Vehicle Launched	9
USSR: U.S. Radar Arrays Seen Violating ABM Treaty (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 10 Sep 86).....	10
IZVESTIYA Examines European Defense Initiative (Ye. Nikolayev; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 15 Sep 86).....	12
TASS: Publication of Anti-Star Wars Book Stopped in UK (Taras Lariokhin; Moscow TASS, 15 Sep 86).....	16
Prague TV: APN Military Commentator Outlines Anti-SDI Steps (Prague Television Service, 22 Aug 86).....	17

Briefs	
Tests in New Mexico	18
U.S. Physicist Resigns	18
U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS	
TASS Report on Washington Round of Experts Talks (Moscow TASS, 7 Sep 86).....	19
USSR: Reports, Comments on Opening of Sixth Round (Various sources, various dates).....	20
Obukhov Arrival Statement	20
'Utter Confusion' in U.S.	21
White House Gags Aides, by A. Shalnev	22
Daniloff Case as Diversion, by Oleg Blinov	23
Sixth Round Opens	23
Obukhov on Reagan Cut Offer	23
Chernyshev Contrasts Stance, by Vladimir Chernyshev	24
Zholkver Sees No Progress, by Vladimir Fadeyev	25
SALT/START ISSUES	
TASS Commentary on U.S. Refusal To Ratify SALT II (Vladimir Bogahev; Moscow TASS, 17 Sep 86).....	26
USSR Foreign Ministry Spokesman Denies Missile Crash (Paris AFP, 18 Sep 86).....	28
Briefs	
USSR Missile Tests	29
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
USSR Lt Col: UK Courts 'Nuclear Enslavement' With Stealth Base (Yu. Yurkin; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 12 Sep 86).....	30
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
USSR: U.S. Attempting To Undermine BW Convention (N. Sinyavin; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 9 Sep 86).....	31
PRAVDA Hits Pentagon Aide's Remarks on Bacteriological Arms (Vladimir Mikhaylov; Moscow PRAVDA, 25 Aug 86).....	33
USSR Reports, Commentary on Geneva BW Conference (Various sources, various dates).....	35
IZVESTIYA on Agenda, USSR Stance, by V. Kuznetsov	35
Conference Opens	36
Report on Israelyan Address, by Yevgeniy Korzhev	36

U.S. 'Fabrications' Condemned	37
U.S. Position on Ban, by Vladimir Tsvetov	38
Israelyan, Lowitz Addresses Conference	39
Alekseyev Commentary, by Sergey Alekseyev	40
U.S. Claims Regarded, by A. Golts	41
'Far-Fetched Accusations', by Yevgeniy Korzhev	42
Talks With UK Delegation	43
IZVESTIYA: Report on Use of Chemical Weapons by DRA Rebels (D. Meshchaninov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 5 Sep 86).....	44
IZVESTIYA Ridicules Angola CW Charge (B. Pilyatskin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 7 Sep 86).....	46
EUROPEAN CONFERENCES	
PRC People's Daily on Soviet Peace Efforts in CDE (Gu Yaoming; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 13 Sep 86).....	48
NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS	
USSR: U.S., World Response to Gorbachev RUDE PRAVO Replies (Various sources, various dates).....	50
Western Reports Faulted, by Aleksandr Zholkver	50
VREMYA Roundup, by Aleksandr Serikov, et al.	51
11 Sep Talk Show, by Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, et al.	52
U.S. 'Silence, Spy Mania', by Yevgeniy Grachev	58
PRAVDA Weekly Review, by Vladimir Peresada	59
14 Sep Talk Show, by Boris Vasilyevich Andrianov, et al.	62
Broadcast to North America, by Vladimir Pozner, et al.	67
Gorbachev Answers Circulated at UN	70
USSR: Reports, Comments on U.S. 11 September Test (Various sources, various dates).....	71
TASS Report, by Igor Ignatyev	71
TASS Commentary, by Yuriy Kornilov	72
Monitoring Issue Dismissed, by Vladimir Tsvetov	73
'Absurd Logic', by Vladimir Bogachev	74
TASS: U.S. Delays Visas for N-Test Monitoring Meeting (Moscow TASS, 16 Sep 86).....	76
USSR's Vorontsov on Test Ban, Summit Chances (Yuliy Vorontsov; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 35, 8 Sep 86)....	77
IZVESTIYA's Bovin Gives Reassurance on Moratorium (Aleksandr Bovin; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 35, 8 Sep 86)....	79

Soviet Army Paper Discusses Verification (Ye. Nikitin; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 31 Aug 86).....	82
USSR: Swedish CD Envoy Says Monitoring 'Absolutely Reliable' (V. Kuznetsov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 7 Sep 86).....	87
USSR: Pyongyang Conference Urges Korean NFZ (Various sources, various dates).....	89
Kim Il-song Addresses Conference	89
Conference Supports Gorbachev Proposals	89
PRAVDA Commentary, by V. Razuvayev	90
Broadcast to China, by Shakov	91
Briefs	
U.S.-Soviet Talks Recess	92

RELATED ISSUES

CPSU Official Zagladin on Control, Disarmament (Rome International Service, 12 Sep 86).....	93
BEIJING REVIEW on Superpower Arms Race (Zhou Jirong, Huang Tingwei; Beijing BEIJING REVIEW, No 37, 15 Sep 86).....	94
PRC Commentaries on Disarmament 'Struggle' (Hong Kong LIAOWANG OVERSEAS EDITION, No 36, 8 Sep 86; Beijing to North America, 12 Sep 86).....	98
International Disarmament Situation, by Li Ginzhen, Li Ginggong	98
Commentary Advocates Conventional Disarmament, by Chen Guang	100

/12223

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR SPACE RESEARCH INSTITUTE HEAD ON SDI, MORATORIUM

LD120847 Moscow TASS in English 0716 GMT 12 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 12 TASS -- Mankind can now be destroyed by pushing a button. The Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests provides an opportunity to remove this danger, journalists were told by Director of the Institute of Space Explorations of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Academician Roald Sagdeyev.

Many U.S. leaders, the academician said, explain their unwillingness to introduce moratorium on nuclear tests by saying that this will make impossible elaboration of the essential elements of the SDI -- actually, the star wars programme, though Washington stubbornly calls it "Strategic Defence Initiative".

One of the variants of technical solution of the Star Wars programme, said the scientist, is linked with the use of the laser beam to direct x-ray radiation. For this it is necessary to explode a nuclear medium-yield device. And therefore new warheads need to be developed and their tests held.

The academician said that the SDI programme was unrealistic. To create real defence from nuclear weapons means to rule out a possibility of penetration of even a few warheads into outer space. But this practically cannot be done, with 10,000-20,000 simultaneously flying warheads.

To put huge echelons of weapons into orbits and then systems to combat with them would signify one more twist in the arms spiral, the scientist said. We should learn to live in peace. There is no other way here but the way of detente in the military sphere. And this points once again to the exclusively great significance of the USSR's decision on extension of the moratorium on nuclear tests, stressed Roald Sagdeyev.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET COLONEL: U.S. REJECTS COMPROMISE ON SDI

PM170934 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Sep 86 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Candidate of Technical Sciences Colonel V. Chernyshov under the rubric "A Reader Inquires": "The Earth in Alpha's Sights"; first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] "I believe that the U.S. Administration's negative reaction to the Soviet proposal to subscribe to the moratorium on nuclear explosions is largely accounted for by the U.S. ruling circles' desire to embark as soon as possible on the deployment of space weapons, some types of which they plan to equip with nuclear ammunition. I would like to know how far the United States has advanced in implementing the notorious 'star wars' program -- V. Ivochkin, Perm."

"The present U.S. Administration is hardly able to drag itself along on matters of limiting and reducing arms," the American ABC-TV company states. The 5 and 1/2 years that the R. Reagan administration has been in power, Western commentators point out, have been a dead loss for the cause of nuclear arms control: The President has not utilized a single chance in this direction, although one and one-half of the two terms granted him in the White House are already behind him.

Whereas the United States has done nothing in matters of disarmament, in the arms race Washington is advancing with 7-league strides. Let us turn to the figures: In the last year of the J. Carter administration appropriations for the production of nuclear arms totaled 3.7 billion dollars, while for Fiscal 1987 they are planned in the sum of 8.2 billion dollars. "The weapons which we purchase today will serve as the basis of the U.S. military forces for many years after the start of the 21st century," U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger loudly declares. But the chief aim of Washington's military policy was revealed very eloquently by R. Bowman, president of the American Institute for Space and Security Studies: "We are tired of equality. The only way we can get back the lever of political pressure is to regain military superiority."

To achieve this aim the U.S. Administration plans to "reinforce" and supplement the American offensive nuclear potential with the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," known throughout the world as the "star wars" program. This program has become one of the chief obstacles at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva.

Guided by the desire to overcome the deadlock at the Geneva talks, the Soviet Union proposed to the United States reaching agreement on partial measures to prevent the militarization of space. It is a question, above all, of a commitment by the sides not to withdraw from the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems (the ABM Treaty) for 15 years, while strictly observing the limitations provided for in it.

However, the U.S. leadership refused to accept this compromise proposal. In this reply, so American newspapers report, the head of the White House expresses readiness to defer the deployment of arms in space under the "star wars" program for just 7 years. For 5 of these years the United States intends to develop [razrabotka] and test ABM components and space strike arms -- which in itself would be a violation of the ABM Treaty's provisions.

During the subsequent 2 years, according to the American plan, talks are to be held on the terms for deploying space systems. If such an agreement is not reached during the 2 years, each side will have the right to deploy a space-based ABM system after giving the other side 6 months' notice.

As the PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER remarked, the proposed "deferment" of SDI deployment for 5-7 years "means little."

In actual fact, by talking of continuing the development [razrabotka] and testing of nuclear space arms, the U.S. Administration is seeking to get the Soviet Union to "legitimize" the former's current emasculation of the ABM Treaty. And by proposing to reach agreement on the deployment of a "star wars" system after 5-7 years have elapsed, it is inviting the USSR to participate in destroying the entire foundation of the process of reducing and limiting strategic arms, one of whose cornerstones is the ABM treaty.

U.S. Administration spokesmen have tried to present this "blank shot" as some kind of "compromise" and a "far-reaching step" by Washington, with which they have even misled certain U.S. "hawks," who do not like even such a limited and meaningless "deferment" of the deployment of space strike arms. The President immediately clamed the "hawks" down. Addressing a group of SDI supporters -- representatives of right-wing conservative organizations -- he declared: "When the time comes and development [razrabotka] (of SDI) is complete, we intend to deploy it." That "revelation" provoked an ovation from the "star wars" apologists who filled the hall.

Why, then, does the obligation not to withdraw from the ABM Treaty for 15 years, while strictly fulfilling the limitations provided for in it, 'not suit' the U.S. Administration, and why is the "deferment" of SDI deployment even by 5-7 years "not to the liking" of some people in the United States?

The present U.S. leadership has decided to work toward implementing the "star wars" program, and to bring it to the point of deployment as soon as possible. P. Buchanan, White House director of communications, for example, frankly states that the purpose of any talks is to "secure the future of SDI."

As for the possible time for starting the deployment of arms under the "star wars" program, it is not as far off as Washington sometimes tries to make out. This is evidenced by the present administration's practical work and its concrete plans. Here they are:

First: The United States has already put the "star wars" machinery into shape. Thus, a "star military-industrial complex," embracing more than 1,500 industrial firms and research organizations which have received orders from the Pentagon to create [sozdaniye] components of space strike arms, has essentially been set up within the military-industrial complex. A joint space command of the U.S. Armed Forces, Air Force and Navy space commands, and an Army space operations office have been knocked

together. They are ready at any moment to put space strike arms into "combat operation." Moreover, among the Pentagon's top leadership there is increasingly frequent talk of the need to form in the very near future an independent new branch of the U.S. Armed Forces -- a military space force which would operate on an equal footing with the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

Second: Arms are being developed [razrabatyvat] for the "star wars" system at an accelerated pace. Several models of chemical lasers (the Miracle, Alpha, (Rashel), and Sigma Tau experimental weapons systems), free-electron lasers, and excimer lasers have already been created. [sozdat].

Underground tests of x-ray lasers pumped by a nuclear explosion are being conducted. Devices which ensure the development [otrabotka] of beam weapons are operating in the nuclear laboratory at Los Alamos and the (Sandia) National Laboratory. A modern accelerator -- a "prototype" of a beam weapon -- is being built at the Lawrence Livermore Radiation Laboratory. American firms and laboratories have built no less than eight different models of electromagnetic guns earmarked for SDI.

Third: The Pentagon has drawn up a general, "integrated" plan for a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements.

Fourth: It is planned to deploy a seven-echelon "star wars" system stage by stage, as particular types of arms become ready, without waiting, in particular, for work to be completed on creating [sozdaniye] "exotic types of weapons. According to a statement by General J. Abrahamson, director of the SDI program, by the early nineties the United States will already be able to deploy "first-generation space weapons," including combat orbital stations with small homing missiles.

Fifth, The Pentagon does not rule out the possibility of deploying at the first stage ground missile complexes to intercept warheads in the final sector of their trajectory. Such means already exist. They have only to be brought up to modern technical standards.

In August of this year representatives of U.S. right-wing organizations held a press conference in Congress "in defense of SDI." They advocated making an immediate start on deploying the "star wars" system. "If we can obtain a system that is efficient and that make the Soviet Union's arms inefficient," Pentagon chief C. Weinberger expressed the "dreams" of the military-industrial complex, "then we will return to the situation when we were the only country to possess nuclear weapons."

Of course, such calculations are hopeless. Our country will not allow itself to be overtaken in the military strategic sphere and will take appropriate countermeasures. "If necessary, we will quickly find a reply, and it will not be what the United States expects," M.S. Gorbachev emphasized in his statement. "But it will be an answer which will make the 'star war' program worthless."

However, implementation of the SDI plans would lead to an absolutely uncontrolled arms race, strategic chaos, universal uncertainty, and an increased risk of nuclear catastrophe. This is why the Soviet Union calls again and again on the U.S. Administration to heed the arguments of reason.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET CHIEF OF STAFF ON 'PROPER REPLY TO SDI'

PM110807 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No. 35, 8 Sep 86 pp 4-5

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, first deputy minister of defense and chief of General Staff, under the general headline "The Historic Chance Must Not Be Missed": "A Military Man's View. We will Find the Proper Reply to SDI"]

[Text] Whitewashing the U.S. Administration's refusal to terminate nuclear explosions, some American representatives contend that since the U.S. is behind the U.S.S.R. in the modernization of nuclear weaponry it needs to stage tests. Washington also says that the U.S.S.R. can afford the moratorium because it is supposedly ahead of the U.S. in the number of tests conducted. These statements are inaccurate. The facts show that it is the U.S. that is in the lead in the number of nuclear tests held, accounting for more than half of all explosions detonated over the entire period worldwide. The U.S. is also in the lead in the number of tests in each medium, in the atmosphere, under ground and under water.

Consider the last two years. In 1984 the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. conducted an approximately equal number of nuclear tests. In 1985 the U.S.S.R. conducted nine tests, prior to its moratorium, while the U.S. staged 20. The U.S.S.R. has staged no nuclear tests for more than a year now, while the U.S. has conducted 18 since our moratorium came into effect. Of this number it reported 15. The other three, which it did not report, were of low capacity. One was held in August 1985, just after the Soviet-announced moratorium, the other two were conducted in the autumn of 1985 and in the spring of 1986. They were recorded by the national technical means available to the Soviet Union.

Hence, the issue is not one of a "lag", but rather that if nuclear testing is stopped, it will be impossible to develop national anti-missile defences or deploy space-based strike weaponry, at any rate on the large scale envisaged in the U.S. Furthermore, the Pentagon intends to modernize its nuclear potential completely. To this end new nuclear warheads are needed, and these must be tested. Some nuclear tests are conducted to ascertain the reliability of existing nuclear devices. However, they account for a very small proportion of tests.

Eighty percent of tests, perhaps even more, are carried out to develop new nuclear weaponry and energy sources for space-based arms.

When U.S. preparations for "star wars" are mentioned, what is meant are plans to employ a multi-tiered system for the anti-missile defence of U.S. territory and to devise and deploy space-based strike weapons. The aim of the U.S. is to make Soviet strategic nuclear forces worthless, disarm the U.S.S.R. and thus acquire the opportunity to

threaten us continually with a massive nuclear-missile strike. The deployment of national ABM defences and space-based strike weaponry will upset the existing military equilibrium between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. generate strategic chaos instead of stability, and drastically increase the danger of nuclear war.

Should the U.S. continue to implement its plans for "star wars" the U.S.S.R. will be obliged to take appropriate measures in response. We will quickly find a suitable reply and, moreover, it will not be what the U.S. expects. It will be a reply that will make the "star wars" programme worthless. The U.S. has no monopoly on scientific and technological progress in the military field. [paragraph continues]

The development of science and technology in this field has reached a level at which the perennial struggle between sword and shield, defensive and offensive weaponry, is decided in many, not just one, directions. The U.S.S.R. is capable of meeting U.S. action to subvert the balance by means of a national anti-missile defence system and space-based strike weaponry. However, strategic offensive weaponry may be improved in a manner that will make the SDI programme fabulously expensive and difficult to implement. There are other possibilities as well.

Of course, if the U.S. deploys SDI we will have to reply. Unfortunately, we shall require additional resources to do so. But why waste resources and manpower devising newer and newer kinds of weaponry? That is another reason, prompted by economic considerations, why we want to end the arms race and are opposed to the development of space-based strike systems.

However, in the present situation the U.S.S.R. is obliged to conduct research in many fields. In some of these we can confidently envisage effective measures to counteract the U.S. SDI programme. They could be promptly implemented should the U.S. deploy a national ABM system and space-based strike weaponry. The U.S.S.R. will choose modes of operation that best accord with its defence interests and will in turn confront the U.S. with the need to find a reply.

But if nuclear testing is stopped, the further development of strategic armaments will also be halted. It will then be well-nigh impossible to deploy either space-based strike weaponry or national anti-missile defences. The U.S.S.R. has a stake in this. In announcing the extension of its moratorium, it hopes that peace-loving states and the world community will support it. The decision to extend the moratorium for the fourth time had to be weighed carefully. It was vital to have an accurate estimation of the balance of forces. Still, we placed ourselves at a definite disadvantage, believing it to be acceptable for the time being. Our own defence capacity and that of our friends is being maintained at proper levels.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: CHALLENGER TRAGEDY SHOWS DANGERS OF SDI

PM291400 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 26 Aug 86 p 3

["International Commentary" by Candidate of Juridical Sciences V. Golubkov:
"The Challenger Tragedy and 'Star Wars'"]

[Text] There has been plenty of analysis of the Challenger tragedy in the Western press. The potential of USAF launch vehicles capable of temporarily replacing the shuttle and the new space-plane technology of the next century are being discussed. Quite a few conclusions have been drawn about the booster rocket casing, poor seals, low fuel quality, and also the destructive capacity of maximum dynamic pressure during boost phase...

But only a few people in the West are considering the fact that mankind will quite soon find itself at a point where it is confronted by a risk on an inconceivable scale. And those fears are unquestionably well-founded, particularly with regard to the current development [razrabotka] of strike weapons under the "star wars" program.

Specialists are now asking whether the United States is not overestimating the potential of its space and electronics equipment, even if it is the most advanced. Can the deciding of questions involving people's fate be entrusted to electronics and equipment? They recall a case--a case thought to be inconceivable from the theoretical standpoint--when five computers backing each other up failed one after the other. Experts maintain the NASA "inadequately studied the technical aspects of the program of shuttle flights," "hurried to turn them into proper commercial flights," set very tight work schedules, and dismissed as insignificant the faults which periodically arose on craft in the series, although no one studied them in depth, just as no one studied their possible consequences, in which connection one Challenger pilot warned about the "possibility of such a tragedy."

But there is another highly symptomatic feature too. Literally hours after millions of television viewers had seen Challenger--that "symbol of U.S. space achievements"--turn into a fireball, some legislators close to the American Administration began assuring people that the catastrophe would not affect the work on the other U.S. space program--the "star wars" program. That observation was no accident, because there is much in common between these two directions in the Pentagon's development [razrabotka] of space strike systems.

First, what we have is the same political and psychological approach--blind faith in the omnipotence of American space equipment. It is clear that with the creation [sozdaniye] of space strike weapon systems important decisions with irreversible consequences will be made by machines rather than people. And yet it was precisely the hardware which failed on Challenger!

Second, the U.S. Administration has demonstrated the same haste regarding the "star wars" program, the same desire to conceal failures and inflate successes, and the same disregard for warnings and criticism from politicians and specialists that the whole program might end in a global tragedy.

Moscow has constantly warned the American Administration about this. America's stubborn desire to create a "universal" space arms system is at best a highly dangerous illusion. However, across the Atlantic they ask with attempted humor: "So why is the USSR worried about SDI if it is an illusion?"

The USSR is worried not because it fears it will be left behind in the space race; if it is forced upon us we will quickly find an answer, and, as was pointed out by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his 18 August statement on Soviet television, the answer "will not be what the United States expects."

The USSR is well aware that it is very easy to turn any "space shield" into a "space sword" and that those who are creating [sozdat] it are deliberately seeking to destroy the military-strategic parity between the powers, leaving aside the possible temptation to use the weapon. Mankind would come dangerously close to a global catastrophe compared with which the Challenger tragedy is a grain of sand as against a sandstorm. And whereas after the Challenger accident it was possible to stop further flights by spacecraft of that series in order to establish the causes, after a global catastrophe human civilization could no longer be restored...

When he made his statement on Soviet television on 18 August M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave the American Administration yet another chance to show that it is really, as opposed to merely verbally, committed to the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons on earth. It is quite clear that instead of creating [sozdat] space strike weapons in the next 10-15 years for the alleged purpose of eliminating nuclear armaments, it is far more sensible to set about destroying those very armaments during those years and reducing them to zero. Such a specific and realistic program has been proposed by the Soviet Union.

Thinking again about whether to plunge the world into a very dangerous space arms race through SDI or embark on sincere efforts to reduce and eliminate nuclear weapons and stop all nuclear weapons tests on the basis of the Soviet Union's proposals--that is what appears to us in Moscow to be the lesson of the Challenger tragedy for both the United States and the whole world.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS REPORTS ON DELTA-SATELLITE SDI TEST

Pentagon Confirmation

LD050647 Moscow TASS in English 0609 GMT 5 Sep 86

["Preparations for Test Under SDI"--TASS heading]

[Text] Washington, 5 Sep (TASS)--A Pentagon spokesman has confirmed the fact that a new test under the Strategic Defense Initiative is now in preparation but refused to comment the details.

AP News Agency has reported, however, that a booster rocket, "Delta", designed to dislodge two payloads into orbit would be launched in the next few days. One of the objectives will be used as a target and the second will perform the role of the killer-satellite.

The principal goal of the experiment is to test guidance and navigation systems and the possibility of tracking the payload with a laser beam with a view to destroying it.

Vehicle Launched

LD052020 Moscow TASS in English 1941 GMT 5 Sep 86

[Text] Washington, 5 Sep (TASS)--A "Delta" delivery vehicle has been launched from the Cosmodrome on Cape Canaveral today. On board the delivery vehicle is equipment for carrying out an experiment under the "star wars" program.

The "Delta" is to put into an orbit a fighter satellite and a target to be destroyed in outer space. According to the UPI agency, a system of orientation and guidance of the satellite against a target is to be tested in the course of the experiment.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1584

6 October 1986

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: U.S. RADAR ARRAYS SEEN VIOLATING ABM TREATY

PM111407 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Sep 86 First Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel I. Gorev under the rubric "Exposed by the Facts": "A Blatant Challenge. The United States Is Violating the ABM Treaty"]

[Text] The U.S. attitude to the observance of international agreements has recently come under close scrutiny by the progressive public. This is no accident. The U.S. Administration's recent decision to stop observing Soviet-American agreements in the strategic offensive arms limitation sphere -- the SALT I Interim Agreement and the SALT II Treaty -- was a clear challenge to the cause of peace. The all-embracing program for rearming America, adopted by Washington in 1981, does not fit the framework of these very important documents. Of the two possibilities -- observance of agreements or the arms race -- the latter was chosen.

One cannot help noticing that something similar is threatening the ABM Treaty as well. It is obviously getting in the way of the implementation of the program for creating extensive ABM defenses, announced by the U.S. Administration in 1983, and proving an obstacle to the implementation of the Pentagon's plans for attaining military superiority over the Soviet Union. U.S. military circles make no bones about this. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger plainly stated: "We must consider the possibility of actually breaking with the ABM Treaty."

It must be stressed that people in the United States are not confining themselves to statements but are actually contravening the ABM Treaty. This is evidenced by the deployment of the big Pave Paws phased array radar station in Greenland (Thule) and preparations for the construction of one in Britain (Fylingdales). Under the ABM Treaty the sides pledged not to deploy missile attack warning radar stations, except on the periphery of their national territory and oriented outward. Major phased array radar stations must not be deployed outside permitted ABM areas (the Grand Forks ICBM base, which is on U.S. territory, in the state of North Dakota, is one such area), outside ABM test sites (the United States has set up sites on Kwajalein Atoll and at White Sands, New Mexico), except for the purpose of tracking objects in outer space or for use as national technical means of verification (kontrol).

Official Pentagon spokesmen have made it plain that the radar stations in Greenland and Britain are missile attack warning stations. So the question arises: Since when have Greenland, which belongs to Denmark, and Britain been U.S. territory or its periphery?

The work being done to construct the new radar stations at the ballistic missile early warning station missile attack warning posts (Thule and Fylingdales) is portrayed by the United States as modernization of the existing radar stations. [paragraph continues]

These claims are obviously false. Even Pentagon spokesmen refer to these radar stations as new ones. For example, G. Keyworth, former under secretary of defense for research and engineering, made it clear to Congress that "the conventional radar stations constructed 20 years ago in Thule are being replaced with a new phased array radar station."

It is perfectly obvious that the construction of a fundamentally different, phased array radar station has been going on since 1984 at the post in Thule, Greenland, to replace the existing four old conventional antenna radar stations. This station is similar to the Pave Paws radar stations which have been deployed or are being constructed on U.S. territory. The potential of the new station in Thule will far exceed the potential of large radar stations as stipulated by the countries [as published] in the ABM Treaty. The new radar station should provide a larger scanning area, increased range, and the capability to track a large number of targets simultaneously.

Confirmation of the fact that new facilities are being constructed at the Thule post in Greenland is provided by this photograph published in a U.S. magazine [the article is accompanied by a small photograph apparently showing a Pave Paws radar installation]. The antenna of the old radar station can be seen behind the antenna system building which is under construction and which is a closed structure around 80 meters high with two planar phased arrays. The Soviet side has repeatedly warned the United States of the illegality of its actions in connection with the construction of the new radar station in Greenland and has proposed a constructive solution to the question, but the United States has not responded positively to the USSR's proposal.

The new U.S. radar station in Britain will also be an obvious violation of the ABM Treaty. Unlike the other Pave Paws stations, this one will have three phased arrays, ensuring all-round observation, as well as a bigger capacity. In this case there can be no question of modernization because the plan is to build a fundamentally new facility: A station of a fundamentally new design will be constructed to replace the radar station which does not have a phased array. This is confirmed by authoritative Western experts who participated in the preparation of the ABM Treaty.

The Soviet Union has warned both the U.S. and British Governments about actions incompatible with the treaty. Nevertheless, in May London officially announced the decision to permit the United States to deploy a new Pave Paws radar station at the Fylingdales post.

These are just a few examples of the scornful U.S. attitude to observance of the ABM Treaty. Yet it is the foundation stone, curbing the strategic arms race, on which future accords in the offensive arms limitation sphere can be built. Washington's line of undermining existing agreements and destroying a system of mutual commitments elaborated through joint efforts is further evidence of the adventurist U.S. course of trying to attain military superiority over the Soviet Union and contradicts the peoples' peace-loving aspirations.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

IZVESTIYA EXAMINES EUROPEAN DEFENSE INITIATIVE

PM151535 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Ye. Nikolayev article: "Clear Skies for Europe"]

[Text] Like Don Quixote tilting at windmills military-political circles in certain West European countries are now thinking up enemies for themselves -- only unlike the hero of Cervantes' novel, not in order to do good but to justify evil: more and more extremely dangerous and destabilizing spirals in the arms race. Referring to some kind of "missile threat" to West Europe, certain figures in the NATO countries, particularly the FRG, are trying to impose on Europeans the idea that it is necessary not only to participate in the U.S. SDI program but to develop [razvitiye] in addition to this their own "European Defense Initiative" (EDI).

To substantiate this initiative the thesis put forward is that if the United States goes further down the road of implementing its "star wars" program the USSR will obviously also create [sozdast] a similar "space shield" for itself in the future. As a result, the NATO strategists point out, Western Europe would be left "exposed" and would turn into a zone of "reduced security." Who knows, they say, whether the United States, hiding from the "Soviet missile threat," will want to defend Western Europe from it, too, despite allegedly promising to do so now.

Seeing that these arguments produced a skeptical reaction from most sober-minded people in the West, the apologists and theoreticians of EDI are also using the following arguments: Even if the U.S. SDI does not produce the results expected by the White House and it does not prove possible to erect a 100-percent "shield" over the United States, the European NATO countries should nonetheless have effective means for combating Soviet missiles, and not only nuclear missiles but those "equipped with chemical and even conventional warheads."

Active calculations are being made about how -- before the creation [sozdaniye] of new SDI means -- to use the air defense systems available to NATO, specifically the U.S. Patriot anti-aircraft missile complexes, for these purposes. It is believed that after certain additions it would be possible to enable these complexes to carry out ABM tasks, that is, to combat ballistic missiles. But the main thing, so the NATO generals say, is to create [sozdaniye] ABM systems and components (including space-based systems and components) specially adapted to European conditions, and to create [sozdat] and utilize to that end the latest technology -- laser and particle beam weapons, electromagnetic guns, and other exotic means of warfare.

Judging by existing reports, the process of implementing EDI is conceived both in the form of independent efforts on the part of West European countries in this sphere and in the form of a two-way street: The West Europeans could participate in implementing the U.S. SDI and SDI would pay scientific and technical dividends for EDI.

The U.S. Administration itself, having set itself the goal of firmly hitching its Western partners to its "star chariot," has recently been listening with increasing persistence to the European idea that before large-scale ABM systems are created [sozdany] their technology could be successfully used within the framework of the U.S. SDI for combating missiles of less than strategic range in the European theater.

U.S. right-wing conservative organizations such as the "Heritage Foundation" publish report after report showing that for the United States it would best to begin deploying space arms from Europe. First, they say, Europe is the frontline for Washington's nuclear strategy, and second, the authors of these reports and recommendations claim that Europe could be used to bypass the bans envisaged by the ABM Treaty on the creation [sozdaniye] of a large-scale ABM system for U.S. territory and on the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment space strike arms.

4 The fact that the U.S. military-industrial complex is interested both in SDI and EDI is clear. But what do the West Europeans themselves think on this score? If it is a question of defending Europe and ensuring a peaceful and nonnuclear future for the continent, why enclose this entire palisade of arms in the form of SDI for Europe, an independent EDI, or combinations of both? Why, one wonders, use a sledgehammer to crack a nut and create [sozdavat] on a continent already crammed with arms more and more types of weapons, when one need only go along with the relevant Soviet proposals and adopt the Soviet program for eliminating nuclear and other types of mass destruction weaponry by the year 2000, so as once and for all and without damaging anyone's security to ensure lasting peace for Europe -- a peace without nuclear and chemical weapons and without space arms. And even conventional arms and armed forces could be greatly reduced, were the West to initiate the necessary work in this direction in accordance with the Warsaw Pact countries' recently submitted proposals on this score. What strange and dangerous logic -- building up arms in the hope of ultimately getting rid of them!

The Soviet Union proposes another way -- a way of reaching agreements which would ensure the prevention of an arms race in space and the ending of it on earth. The Soviet side is prepared to take major steps in this direction, including partial solutions. It has put corresponding proposals on the negotiating table with the United States, which would lead to concrete results, were matters to go forward.

On 18 August this year the statement on Soviet television by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, announced the Soviet side's decision to extend the more than year-long unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions to 1 January 1987.

The ending of nuclear tests by the two major nuclear powers -- the USSR and the United States -- would by itself be an important step along the path toward eliminating nuclear weapons. Without tests it would be impossible to improve and create [sozdavat] new types of nuclear weapons, including combat nuclear-pumped lasers within the SDI program.

Given a ban on space strike arms the Soviet side would be prepared to embark on a radical, 50-percent, reduction in Soviet and U.S. nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory; at the same time it advocates reducing the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe by eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone as a first step toward completely ridding the European continent of nuclear weapons.

As for Soviet operational-tactical missiles, as has already been publicly stated by the Soviet side, in the event of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe being entirely eliminated, Soviet enhanced-range operational-tactical missiles would be withdrawn from GDR and Czechoslovak territory.

As soon as agreement is reached on medium-range missiles in Europe the Soviet side would be prepared to immediately embark on working out accords on missiles of less than 1,000-km range with regard to this zone. On the whole it is proposed to radically resolve the question of tactical nuclear weapons in the second phase of the implementation of the Soviet program aimed at ridding the planet of nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

Good prospects for an accelerated solution to this problem are opened up by the Warsaw Pact states' initiative on armed forces and conventional arms reductions in Europe: Along with the European states' reduced ground forces and tactical aircraft as well as reductions to the corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces and means deployed in Europe, their organic arms, including nuclear weapons, would also be reduced.

In this context we should recall what was stated by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, during his meeting with British parliamentarians. If, he said, a NATO country such as Britain, for instance, decided to eliminate its nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union would be prepared to respond by making an equivalent reduction in its nuclear potential. And if foreign nuclear weapons were removed from British territory the Soviet Union would guarantee that its nuclear means would not be targeted against British territory and would never be used against Britain.

Unfortunately, dodging these vitally importance Soviet initiatives which make sense to everyone, NATO militarist circles have been continuing with considerable fervor to support the European version of "star wars." This is an extremely dangerous and destabilizing course for the entire strategic situation. Both the spread of SDI action to Europe and the implementation of an independent EDI are an essentially new component in Washington's global strategy aimed at obtaining military superiority over the USSR and represent attempts to involve the West European countries increasingly extensively in U.S. military and space preparations.

A West European ABM system, were one to be created [sozdana], would be used in conjunction with existing U.S. and NATO offensive nuclear arms in Europe. It therefore cannot be seen as anything but a direct supplement to the nuclear arsenals existing on the continent and a kind of "antimissile umbrella" intended, in particular, to protect the Pershing 2 and ground-launched cruise missiles which the United States is continuing to site in West Europe. And the EDI means themselves, West European military figures and experts point out, could be used for striking against targets directly on the other side's territory.

It is also obvious that a "European Defense Initiative" fully accords with the new aggressive concept recently espoused by NATO of inflicting massive strikes deep inside the territories of the Warsaw Pact countries. Termed the "Rogers Plan" -- after the U.S. general who is supreme allied commander NATO forces, Europe -- this concept is a version specially adapted for West Europe of the "Airland Battle" doctrine adopted by the U.S. Army in its new regulations. It emphasizes massive preventive deep strikes against the enemy's defenses with both the latest nonnuclear arms -- approximate to nuclear weapons in terms of their destructive potential -- and nuclear chemical arms. The systems that it is proposed to create [sozdat] within the EDI framework would be wholly included in this aggressive plan.

The negative consequences of implementing EDI would not be long in materializing. The Soviet side would be unable to remain neutral were the NATO countries to create [sozdaniye] and be equipped with these new arms. Countermeasures would be taken to restore equilibrium. [paragraph continues]

The implementation of EDI would seriously undermine the efforts to reduce the level of military confrontation on the continent and would create additional difficulties at all forums where talks are conducted on arms limitation and reduction, including the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva.

By embarking on the path of implementing EDI, the West European countries would give impetus to a new, dangerous, and costly spiral in the arms race, which would sharply destabilize the situation both in Europe and beyond. European security and international security as a whole would be undermined rather than strengthened.

In short, this is not the course which should be followed. There is another hopeful prospect being opened up for lasting security and peace in Europe by the Soviet initiatives. This is also promoted by the restraint shown by the Soviet Union on military matters, examples of which are the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions, the ending of deployment of Soviet medium-range missiles in the European zone since last April, the removal of SS-20 missiles from combat duty in April of the same year, and the fact that the Soviet side has not tested any antisatellite weapons. The Soviet side's constructive approach is thus obvious. It is a reality and West Europe need only make use of it.

Everyone can see that the Europeans are tired of nerve-racking confrontation and tension. It is necessary to entirely rid political thinking of the concept of Europe as a "military theater." It must really become an example of the coexistence of sovereign, different, but peace-loving states that recognize their interdependence and base their relations on trust. The way toward this lies through ridding Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals -- of the explosive burden of arms.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: PUBLICATION OF ANTI-STAR WARS BOOK STOPPED IN UK

LD152247 Moscow TASS in English 1200 GMT 15 Sep 86

[Text] London, 15 Sep (TASS)--TASS correspondent Taras Lariokhin reports:

Certain circles in Britain obviously did not like the book by Richard Annals dealing with the dangerous character of the U.S. "star wars" program which was being prepared for publication. Without any explanations the John Wiley and Sons Limited Publishing House which already brought out the advance copies of the book, stopped its further publication.

This sudden decision was obviously taken under the pressure of certain quarters, Annals pointed out in a letter to the publishers. The publishing house has published several thousand copies of the book already, which are now locked [up]. Moreover, the title of the book was ruled out of all the catalogues. The letter emphasized that in a truly free society books were published to be read and not to be burned or turned into waste paper.

The book which is of publicistic nature reflects not only the critical attitude of the author to the U.S. plans of the militarization of space, but also the views on this problem of Neil Kinnock, leader of the Labor Party, Shirley Williams, chairman of the Social Democratic Party, and David Steel, leader of the Liberal Party. Last July copies of the book were sent out to British mass media organs, representatives of the Conservative Government of Britain and the U.S. Department of State.

Annals said that when writing the book, he did not think about profits. He only wanted to bring home to people what he regards as the most important aspects of the problem. According to Annals, the book is not of a slanderous nature, and its publication does not violate either the British or American laws. He came to the conclusion that the publishers had been intimidated.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAGUE TV: APN MILITARY COMMENTATOR OUTLINES ANTI-SDI STEPS

LD221827 Prague Television Service in Czech and Slovak 1730 GMT 22 Aug 86

[No video available]

[Summary] The world's press has commented on the extended Soviet nuclear test moratorium. Today's PRAVDA also carries an article on this topic. "As Comrade Gorbachev said on Monday, the Soviet Union will quickly find an answer which will devalue the star wars program."

Our Moscow correspondent Jiri Vitous asked Vasiliy Morozov, the military and political commentator of APN agency about what is behind this formulation from the military point of view.

[Begin Morozov recording in Russian with superimposed Czech translation]
"The answer to the question of what measures could devalue the U.S. star wars program can be divided into two basic categories. The first is a possibility which is technically fully realistic to make the operation of this very complicated system impossible by means of space mines [kosmickych min] and other means. It is not such a problem to put space control elements [ridici kosmicke clanky], communication elements, and energy sources out of operation. And the second category of retaliatory measures is the development and perfecting of such means which would, to put it simply, break through this space shield. This would then mean increasing the potential of missiles on Soviet territory, increasing their striking force and accuracy. Where will all this lead? It will lead to the fact that the efforts of the United States to achieve its long-awaited nuclear supremacy over the Soviet Union will be broken and the star wars program will become simply an illusion which will nevertheless cost American tax payers an enormous amount of money but will still not bring the expected effect."
[end recording]

/9738

CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

TESTS IN NEW MEXICO--Washington, 12 Sep (TASS)--The United States has conducted another test of its anti-missile system. According to a Pentagon spokesman, a modernized Patriot anti-aircraft missile was launched from the White Sands, New Mexico, Missile Range on Thursday. For the first time, the missile, designed to destroy enemy planes, intercepted and destroyed a Lance missile in flight. The ASSOCIATED PRESS [AP] observed that the test was carried out within the framework of the program of developing weapons to be used tactical missiles, initiated by the Pentagon in 1984. An amount of U.S.\$56 million was allocated to the Defense Department for these purposes this year alone. The AP noted that the new anti-missile system was intended for deployment on the territory of the Western European NATO countries. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0610 GMT 12 Sep 86 LD] /9738

U.S. PHYSICIST RESIGNS--San Francisco, 11 Sep (TASS)--Physicist Peter Hagelstein, one of the top U.S. physicists working on President Reagan's "star wars" program, has quit it on political grounds. Peter Hagelstein was co-author of the theory of x-ray lasers based on nuclear explosion energy and headed a relevant project at the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory in California. As was admitted by senior officials of the laboratory, discoveries of Hagelstein who turned 32 not so long ago, were of the key significance for the whole star wars program. Motivating his decision, the physicist said he wanted to do work that would "benefit all mankind". [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1427 GMT 11 Sep 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1584

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

TASS REPORT ON WASHINGTON ROUND OF EXPERTS' TALKS

LD070519 Moscow TASS in English 0511 GMT 7 Sep 86

[Text] Washington September 7 TASS -- The second round of Soviet-U.S. expert consultations on nuclear and space arms took place here on September 5 and 6.

They were held in preparation for the forthcoming visit between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz.

The group of Soviet experts at the consultations was led by Ambassador Viktor Karpov, while the U.S. expert group was led by Ambassador Paul Nitze.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1583

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR: REPORTS, COMMENTS ON OPENING OF SIXTH ROUND

Obukhov Arrival Statement

LD161639 Moscow TASS in English 1617 GMT 16 Sep 86

[Text] Geneva September 16 TASS -- The Soviet delegation to the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons arrived here today to conduct the 6th round of the talks.

The acting head of the delegation, Ambassador at large A.A. Obukhov, said in a statement made at the airport upon arrival that the Soviet Union's line at the talks was clear and precise. It is based on the foreign policy goals formulated by the 27th CPSU Congress and on the Program, formulated by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on January 15, for the stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the current century provided an arms race in outer space is effectively prevented.

Seeking to lessen and eventually eliminate the threat of nuclear war and to strengthen strategic stability, the Soviet side presented at the talks a series of far-reaching proposals.

As a counterbalance to the "star wars" plans, we call for a total ban on space strike weapons, for the development of peaceful cooperation in space, for "star peace." If the problems of space are resolved in this manner, it will become possible and quite realistic to make deep cuts, up to 50 per cent, in the Soviet and U.S. nuclear weapons reaching each other's territories.

The Soviet Union's proposal on the elimination of American and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe is promoting the goal of the drastic lowering of the level of nuclear confrontation and the normalization of the situation in Europe and elsewhere, the Soviet delegate said. This question can be resolved if the USA shows realism and goodwill. The Soviet side, we repeat, stands for bold and drastic measures to put an end to military rivalry. But we, naturally, are far from taking an "all or nothing" stand. The Soviet delegation arrived at the talks with the instruction to continue a search for ways to overcome deadlocks and to find quick and mutually acceptable solutions to questions standing in the way of progress. We are not seeking military advantage. However, reciprocity and complementary efforts from the American delegation are needed here.

To achieve accord the Soviet Union, taking account of the position of the United States, tabled compromise proposals at the previous round of the talks. An important role, in particular, from the point of view of providing favourable conditions for the drafting of accords at the talks on nuclear and space weapons, would be played by the ending of nuclear tests on a reciprocal basis. The USSR has not conducted nuclear explosions since August last year. Recently our unilateral moratorium was extended to January 1, 1987. This fact is self-evident. The Soviet side suggests that the termination of nuclear tests be the subject of a real accord with the USA, which could give an impetus to the solution of other questions.

In short, we are resolutely for breaking the deadlock at the talks at long last and for achieving practical progress at them on the basis of mutual understanding, recorded in the joint Soviet-American statement of November 21, 1985, and strictly in accord with the requirement of equal security. We would like to hope that the American side will give at the new round of the talks a businesslike and constructive answer to the Soviet initiatives. In conclusion the head of the Soviet delegation thanked the citizens and authorities of the Geneva canton for their hospitality and cordiality.

'Utter Confusion' in U.S.

LD170005 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 16 Aug 86

[Text] In the past few days there has been much talk in the American mass media about the letter sent by President Reagan to the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in Moscow. Here is what Valentin Zorin writes:

The letter is a response to Mikhail Gorbachev's new important proposals on disarmament and Soviet-American relations. Without waiting for Moscow's reaction to the letter from the White House the American news media have launched a wide campaign which gives the impression of being organized and inspired in advance. The campaign mainly aims at making the world and the American public believe that Washington has studied the Soviet initiatives constructively and in a detailed way and it is now Moscow's turn to respond. As President Reagan put it, the ball is now in their court.

However, President Reagan's well-publicized message falls short of a substantive response to the constructive proposals addressed by the Kremlin to the White House at the end of June. The information made public in the United States shows that there has been no major change in the American stand. So far Washington has not answered the Soviet proposals constructively. There is utter confusion in Washington on important issues. High ranking administrative officials have been making statements that rule out each other. They first say that the Strategic Defense Initiative could be discussed at Soviet-American talks and then make clarifications and amendments indicating that there can be no talks on the Strategic Defense Initiative. One can only wonder what Washington officials really think and why they quite often contradict each other on one and the same issue. Let us put the question this way: What's new in the American stand on disarmament, on ways to stop nuclear testing and prevent an arms race in outer space? Judging by reports published in the United States the latest Washington documents contained nothing that would give the opportunity and grounds to claim that Washington has done its part and it is now for Moscow to act.

It looks like an attempt is in the making to substitute a noisy campaign in the press and a desire to score points in a propaganda drive for real steps to meet the Soviet Union half way.

White House Gags Aides

PM151525 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 4

[A. Shalnev "Rejoinder": "So As To Avoid 'Unnecessary' Questions"]

[Text] Washington has no intention of being soft. A ban was imposed last Monday on journalists' contacts with administration officials dealing with arms control issues. Any official who breaks the ban and gives an interview without special permission confirmed at the very top will do so at the cost of his job.

According to explanations which a high-ranking administration spokesman -- who, nevertheless, sensibly requested that his name not be mentioned by the press -- succeeded in giving prior to the imposition of the "sanctions," the White House is worried about "leaks of important information." Such leaks, the spokesman whispered confidentially to reporters, are advantageous to "the Russians," and therefore the ban being imposed is necessary for the sake of national security.

The spokesman keeps silent about many things. And mainly about the fact that there is no such thing as unapproved leaks of information in Washington. There is always someone behind any leak, be it a high-ranking official in the Department of State, the Pentagon, the CIA, or the White House. Examples? Plenty of them. One can recall in particular how, in November 1984, selected journalists were confidentially briefed on "active military preparations conducted by Nicaragua with help from the Soviet Union." The information proved to be false, but it was passed on to reporters by none other than Robert McFarlane, who at the time was assistant to the President for national security affairs, who, for the sake of persuasiveness, referred to "secret intelligence reports which have only just come to hand."

One can also recall how President Reagan himself, in yet another attempt to justify the malicious anti-Libyan campaign, said openly before tens of millions of viewers that the United States is engaged in the interception of diplomatic correspondence. These revelations shocked the U.S. intelligence community: After all, they made public information which is a secret of the secret service.

Finally, one can also recall the large stream of information on the contents of the "strictly confidential letter" on arms control issues which President Reagan sent to the Kremlin at the end of July. Bearing in mind that not more than about a dozen people at the very top echelons of the Washington administration were involved in composing the letter, one can suppose that the leak through the White House tried to give the impression that its stance was "constructive" did not spring by itself but was approved.

So, what is the reason behind the ban that has been imposed? One cannot give a precise answer. It is, however, impossible not to notice that a similar ban was imposed by the White House last January, immediately after M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, put forward the program for complete nuclear disarmament by the year 2000. This was done, in particular, in order to relieve administration officials of the need to answer pointed questions by reporters who were trying to elucidate Washington's true attitude toward the termination of the arms race and toward nuclear disarmament.

Obviously, the White House does not want to come across any pointed questions now, when it is not prepared to reply to the initiatives by "those Russians" in any other way but "No! No! No!"

Daniloff Case as Diversion

LD181446 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0230 GMT 18 Sep 86

[From the "International Diary" presented by Oleg Blinov]

[Excerpt] The sixth round of Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons opens today in Geneva. Our country's position is precise and clear. It is based on foreign policy directives as elaborated by the 27th CPSU Congress, on the program set out by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 15 January on the stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the present century in conditions when the arms race in space would be reliably averted. Unfortunately, on the U.S. side a readiness to move toward real accords is still not observable. On the contrary, Washington uses minor or fabricated problems to evade a solution to the very important issues of the present day. Thus, for example, across the ocean now emphasis is being placed on the incident of the detention in Moscow of the American correspondent, Daniloff, who was caught spying. Such a position is not in keeping with the demands of the world public. In the United States itself a campaign is growing, whose participants are urging the U.S. Government to follow the example of the USSR and stop nuclear tests. [passage omitted]

Sixth Round Opens

LD180930 Moscow TASS in English 0925 GMT 18 Sep 86

[Text] Geneva, 18 Sep (TASS)--The sixth round of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments began here today.

Obukhov on Reagan Cut Offer

AU181408 Paris AFP in English 1405 GMT 18 Sep 86

[Excerpt] Geneva, Sept 18 (AFP) -- U.S.-Soviet arms talks made little headway Thursday as the first session of the sixth round of Nuclear and Space Talks (NST) here ended after two hours, and a bilateral conference of experts was wound up for two months. At the NST negotiations neither side would comment after the inaugural session of the sixth round of talks.

The deputy head of the Soviet delegation, Aleksey Obukhov, said before the meeting he had not received official confirmation of President Reagan's widely-reported offer to ask for only a 30 per cent cut on strategic nuclear arms on both sides, instead of the 50 per cent he had originally asked for. The concession was termed "conciliatory" by White House staff when it was announced on Wednesday, but Mr. Obukhov said Thursday: "We don't yet know the American proposals. If introduced, they will be evaluated on their merits." He said the Soviet Union was more interested in a commitment from Washington to abide by the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty for 15 to 20 years than concessions on strategic nuclear weapons.

The Reagan administration, keen on developing the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI or Star Wars) shield in space, which would be an anti-ballistic missile system, wants to be rid of the ABM Treaty within seven years at most. [passage omitted]

Chernyshev Contrasts Stance

LD181642 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1435 GMT 18 Sep 86

[TASS military affairs observer Vladimir Chernyshev: "Assumed Optimism and Dangerous Policy"]

[Text] Moscow, 18 Sep TASS -- The White House statement devoted to the start of the sixth round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva draws one's attention to the deliberate bias in stating the U.S. position, the prevalence of cheerful tones, and the complete disregard for the true state of affairs. According to the statement, Washington is allegedly full of resolution to reach agreements which will lead to reductions in nuclear arsenals. Washington has allegedly already demonstrated at Geneva that it is doing everything to effect reductions, and the U.S. position provides foundation for reaching an agreement.

Everything is being put upside down. In the first place, is there any foundation for the claims that the U.S. Administration wants any agreements? Are they needed by one who conducts a feverish nuclear arms race? The United States is implementing the "star wars" program, including the development [razrabotka] of its nuclear components; is conducting nuclear explosions and tests of antisatellite weapons; is creating [sozdayut] "third generation"-nuclear weapons; has started deploying [razvertyvaniye] new MX IBMs; is arming itself with nuclear-missile submarines one after the other; and is equipping strategic bombers, surface ships, and submarines with cruise missiles. Such measures can hardly testify to a wish to limit and reduce nuclear armaments.

Second, can someone who hitherto has obviously been happy to mark time have the right to voice optimism regarding the state of affairs at the talks and his own position? Also, a complete absence of desire to seek new approaches, making it possible to clear the obstacles on the road to mutually acceptable agreements, has been characteristic of Washington. The White House statement is completely silent on the question of nonmilitarization of space. No wonder. For the representatives of the U.S. Administration are continually stressing that the SDI program cannot serve as the subject of talks, and the United States intends to deploy a space ABM system. The proposals concerning strategic arms and medium-range nuclear weapons are aimed at one-sided military advantages for the United States, and are not calculated to be acceptable to the other side. Thus, at the talks themselves, Washington adheres to a patently deadlock situation.

Third, Washington distorts the position of the Soviet Union, or at best keeps silent about the fact that the USSR has a serious and responsible attitude to the talks, and words its proposals concretely, in businesslike fashion, taking into account the interests of the other side. The Soviet Union has taken quite a few steps in order to bring the positions closer on a broad spectrum of problems. For instance, at the fifth round it made a proposal to the United States to reach agreement on partial, interim measures which might be accepted right now. He who distorts or keeps silent about the constructive position of his talks partner obviously calculates to place the blame for the results of his own destructive policy onto the USSR.

In the nuclear-space age, time for making responsible decisions is fast running out. The USSR delegation is in Geneva with instructions to continue the search for ways leading to a quick mutually-acceptable unraveling of the questions preventing progress. It is to be hoped that Washington will at last respond in worthy fashion and will give a businesslike and constructive reply to the Soviet initiatives.

Zholkver Sees No Progress

LD190448 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 18 Sep 86

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Vladimir Fadeyev]

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons resumed in Geneva today. I ask our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver to tell us about the situation there.

[Zholkver] The current round of the talks in Geneva is the sixth since their start in March of last year. Unfortunately, one must state that the matter has not moved an inch toward an agreement on arms reduction thus far.

Why? Fairly specific and constructive proposals by our country have been lying on the negotiating table for a long time in Geneva. They concern a complete ban on strike space weapons, a reduction by half of the Soviet and U.S. strategic weapons, and the liquidation of both U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe. But what has the United States been concerned with all this time? With conducting one nuclear test after another, the majority of which are connected, as the U.S. military themselves admit, with the development [razrabotka] of space weapons, with producing new intercontinental MX missiles, which -- even circumventing the decision by the U.S. Congress -- are already being put on combat alert duty, and with placing new Pershing and cruise missiles in Western Europe even above the number announced beforehand. Where can one find time to think about developing a disarmament agreement when, as we can see, the arms race is in full swing!

However, the threat looming over mankind is too great to tolerate. And the Soviet Union is making every effort to move the talks in Geneva from the standstill. Halting nuclear tests would have enormous importance in creating favorable conditions for developing mutually acceptable accords. As you know, our country has once again, for the fourth time, extended the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear blasts. If one could reach agreement with the United States to make the moratorium a bilateral one, this would not only strengthen mutual trust but also would prompt the solution of other questions, all the more so as our delegation in Geneva is far from taking an all-or-nothing stand and has submitted compromise proposals more than once.

It was officially announced in the White House yesterday that the U.S. delegation in Geneva will also submit some new proposals this time. Well, better late than never. Suspensions only arise from the fact that Western news agencies, while reporting about this, note that Washington is seeking not so much to reach an agreement in Geneva as to recover, as they put it, from the propagandist defeat in the fight against the Soviet moratorium. Time will tell, as the saying goes. As for the Soviet Union, the staunch struggle for curbing the arms race is not propaganda for us but a strategic line mapped out by the 27th party congress and again reiterated by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in the course of his current trip to Kuban.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1583

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS COMMENTARY ON U.S. REFUSAL TO RATIFY SALT II

LD171904 Moscow TASS in English 1839 GMT 17 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS -- TASS military writer Vladimir Bogahev writes:

In 1984, during the election campaign people close to U.S. President Ronald Reagan constantly stressed in their public speeches that the head of the White House sincerely wished to go down in history as a peacemaker, that in case he was elected President of the United States for the second term, arms control would be problem number one in his activity.

The way this problem number one is solved by the current U.S. leadership and what it means when it speaks about arms control are shown by White House's actions as regards the Soviet-U.S. SALT-2 treaty which was signed before Reagan took office.

Given all the differences in the approaches of the USSR and the United States to problems of war and peace, which are brought about by the two states' socio-economic systems, there existed before 1981 a certain identity of the sides' views on the need to maintain stability, on the danger of the unconstrained race in the destabilizing types of weapons.

Both USSR's leaders and officials of the previous U.S. Administration's sought to avoid situations under which vital decisions would be taken in a matter of minutes, when developments could escape control threatening with catastrophic consequences. It is precisely this concurrence of views on problems of stability that had made it possible to reach by 1979 a number of important agreements on bridling the arms race, including the SALT-2 treaty.

The 1979 treaty became the result of the sides' reasonable compromise. Eager to erect effective barriers in the way of building up nuclear armaments, the Soviet Union met the American side halfway on a number of all-important issues.

American specialists highly evaluated the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty which, among other things, limited the number of nuclear warheads on strategic missiles, set the ceiling on the number of delivery vehicles, banned interference with the activity of observation satellites, excluded the possibility of deploying some classes of missiles which harbour particular danger and stipulated other measures which would substantially scale down the risk of a world nuclear war.

Washington, however, has refused under far-fetched pretexts to ratify this important agreement.

The new administration which moved into the White House in 1981, announced that the SALT-2 treaty was "fatally flawed". Its officials emphasized that the United States did not consider itself to be bound by the treaty terms.

Faced with pressure from the world public, however, the White House made a statement in 1982 to the effect that the United States would not undertake actions that would undercut SALT-2. Now, it has become perfectly obvious that the Reagan administration had never intended to observe this agreement.

In May 1986, when U.S. military programmes began for the first time breaking out of SALT-2 bounds, Washington announced at once that the treaty was "dead."

The decision by the White House sparked off outrage among the world public. Even the most loyal "Atlanticists" in NATO West European countries called in question its wisdom. The House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress voted for banning the release of funds for developing armaments to be deployed in breach of the SALT-2 treaty, a move which enraged President Reagan.

What is the reason behind Washington's position with respect to the treaty which, in the opinion of the overwhelming majority of experts, is beneficial to the United States?

The point is that the U.S. Administration wants to dismantle the last barrier to the arms race. The fact that SALT-2 establishes strategic parity does not suit it. Washington now wants to secure for itself a free reign to realize its illusory plans of gaining military superiority. Having discarded the SALT-2, the United States has embarked on the dangerous road of undermining international security, magnifying the threat of a nuclear war which can have catastrophic consequences for the peoples of our planet, including for the American people.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1586

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR FOREIGN MINISTRY SPOKESMAN DENIES MISSILE CRASH

AU181434 Paris AFP in English 1428 GMT 18 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow, Sept 18 (AFP) -- The Soviet Union thursday denied a U.S. defense report which said that an unarmed Soviet ballistic missile had crashed in northern China last week.

"One of our missiles was launched during regular maneuvers but it did not go beyond the Soviet border," said Boris Pyadishev, a Foreign Ministry spokesman.

China has until now refused to comment on the report, which said that a SSN8 missile, without a warhead, launched from a Delta-type submarine in the Barents Sea towards a distant target in Soviet Territory north of China, veered off course.

The U.S. report said it swerved south and came down close to the Amur River, which marks the Soviet-Chinese border.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1586

SALT/START ISSUES

BRIEFS

USSR MISSILE TESTS--Moscow, 17 Sep (TASS)--Carrier rockets will be launched in the Soviet Union to the regions of the Pacific Ocean during the period between 20 September and 4 October 1986. These will be confined to a circumference with a radius of 70 nautical and 174 degrees 20 minutes east longitude; and 14 degrees 10 minutes north latitude and 175 degrees 10 minutes east longitude. TASS is authorized to state that in order to ensure safety, the USSR Government asks the governments of other states which use sea and air routes in the Pacific Ocean to instruct relevant bodies so that sea and air vessels should not enter these regions and the airspace above them daily between 1200 and 1900 local time. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1210 GMT 17 Sep 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1586

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR LT COL: UK COURTS 'NUCLEAR ENSLAVEMENT' WITH STEALTH BASE

PM150927 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Sep 86 First Edition p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Yurkin "Rejoinder": "Suiting the Pentagon"].

[Text] The Pentagon is bending over backward to obtain a special weapon -- the so-called "invisible" aircraft being developed under the "Stealth" program. It is claimed that this new technology is the "greatest technical leap of the century, of substantial military importance." And it will allegedly permit the United States to acquire "manned and unmanned vehicles which existing air defense systems are inadequately equipped to detect and destroy" -- that was how the Pentagon propagandized the news back in 1990.

The U.S. officials responsible intend to deploy the first consignment of 30 "Stealth" reconnaissance aircraft not at home but far away, albeit somewhere where they will still feel at home -- the USAF base at Lakenheath, Suffolk, in eastern England. "Their arrival," THE MAIL ON SUNDAY newspaper, which maintains close links with the New World, state, "will mean that Britain is again at the frontline of U.S. defense, as was the case in the raid on Libya."

Yes, Britain's senior NATO partner is again giving it an extremely unseemly role. And a risky one, too. For, as is well known, U.S. "Stealth" technology is being used to create not only a reconnaissance aircraft but first and foremost a nuclear weapons platform -- the ATB strategic bomber. Series production of the ATB is planned to start in 1988-1980.

The very "invisibility" -- or rather, the low detectability of the "Stealth" aircraft -- is fraught with extremely dangerous consequences. Just ponder this simple task: How is one to distinguish a "Stealth" reconnaissance aircraft from a nuclear-capable "Stealth"? And how would any of you readers act if you saw an "invisible" plane in the air headed for your hometown? For your further consideration may I suggest the following opinion of General B. Rogers, supreme allied commander, NATO Forces, Europe: "The only possible way of detecting whether an attack is being launched with nuclear weapons or not is to wait for the first large nuclear mushroom cloud to appear."

And the second question: Would you wait disinterestedly for the "result" of the flight or take retaliatory measures commensurate with the situation? And only against the aircraft? Or also against those who sent it? In other words, those who hand over their territory for U.S. militarist ventures are taking yet another step toward U.S. nuclear enslavement. An extremely dangerous step into "invisibility," so to speak -- into nowhere. Not to see that would be a crime.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1588

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: U.S. ATTEMPTING TO UNDERMINE BW CONVENTION

PM111118 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Sep 86 Second Edition p 3

[N. Sinyavin article under the rubric "The Facts Expose": "Playing with Death"]

[Text] In 1972 the United States signed the International Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction. Administration spokesmen assert that the United States unswervingly abides by this convention. Unfortunately, the facts attest to just the opposite. An article published by the American journal SCIENCE gives a graphic impression of the Pentagon's far-reaching plans in this field.

...In August 1984, the day after Congress ended work before the summer vacation, (Kvirsh), assistant to the secretary of the army, made what was at first glance an extremely modest request of the legislators. In his letter he proposed redistributing 66 million dollars from the Pentagon budget. At the very end of the list of new programs proposed by him was the creation of a laboratory to study aerosols on the territory of the Dugway military test range in Utah.

In accordance with the established procedure in such cases (Kvirsh's) request was examined without a formal hearing, vote, or discussion. [paragraph continues]

"It seemed that there was nothing in the document to arouse suspicion or doubt," recalled Senator Sasser, who was one of the four participants in the examination of the request. However, it became clear that this was precisely the impression that the Pentagon figures had been hoping to produce in order to avoid the procedure of an official discussion in Congress.

Later, after attentively analyzing the (Kvirsh) proposal, Sasser came to the conclusion that Congress had in this way approved an unprecedented expansion in military programs in the sphere of bacteriological weapons. To all intents and purposes, he admitted, the four senators had legalized the creation of a powerful center whose main task was to study particularly dangerous aerosol biological substances such as pathogens of the most serious hemorrhagic fevers and the Lassa, (Ebola), Marburg, and other viruses.

The Pentagon is giving the new laboratory the leading role in preparations for bacteriological warfare. Sasser openingly stated that the laboratory is being created exclusively for research into biological and toxic weapons banned under the 1972 International Convention. The senator has protested his own approval of the project, which has generated furious attacks from the Pentagon.

The laboratory being created by the Pentagon for aerosol means of waging bacteriological warfare, SCIENCE points out, is only a small part of the global program to modernize and expand the potential to test extremely toxic and strong chemical and biological substances at the Dugway test range -- a military base covering 113,000 hectares. A complex is now under construction there for studying particularly dangerous viruses and bacteria that cause fatal diseases.

Many specialists who were approached by SCIENCE stated that the aerosol laboratory making up part of the complex could be used to create genetically altered viruses and bacteria which would be highly resistant to medicines -- in other words, to create offensive bacteriological weapons prohibited under the 1972 convention. The most probable direction of the work is to transfer the genes of pathogenic micro-organisms to bacteria able to propagate rapidly among limited populations or ethnic groups. It is worth noting that even after the storm of scandal and the revelation of ignoble manipulations in Congress, the U.S. Department of the Army is insisting that its application be satisfied. "The request is still with Congress, and we are hopeful that a positive decision will be taken on it," department spokesman Lieutenant Colonel (Koklashauer) repeats from day to day with a soldier's burly persistence.

- 4 Having rejected observance of the SALT II treaty on trumped-up pretexts, the Washington administration is now clearly setting its sights on undermining the 1972 International Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction. In beginning construction at the Dugway test range, the Pentagon is taking a demonstrative and dangerous step in this direction.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1585

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

PRAVDA HITS PENTAGON AIDE'S REMARKS ON BACTERIOLOGICAL ARMS

PM261843 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Aug 86 First Edition p 5

["Our Commentary" by Vladimir Mikhaylov: "Greatness and Insignificance"]

[Test] The liberation of earth from devastating epidemics has always been considered a feat. Monuments marking the victory over the plague still stand in Europe's ancient cities. Generation upon generation add the adjective "great" to the names of Pasteur, Koch, Mechnikov, Virkhov, Gamaleya, and many other conquerors of infectious diseases. To judge by the latest reports, however, people in the Pentagon have decided to radically change established usage and to award this lofty title to the actual carriers of epidemics.

It may sound monstrous, but this is precisely what is said in a statement by a Department of Defense spokesman, only just declassified in Washington. Deputy Assistant Secretary Douglas Feith declared: "New technology has undermined former ideas about biological weapons... Now we are saying that bacteriological weapons made on the basis of new technology can become truly great." This statement at the session of a subcommittee of a U.S. House of Representatives special committee testifies, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, that "some groupings within the Reagan Administration, and particularly in the Pentagon, are evaluating biological weapons in a new light."

So what has changed? "Previously," the newspaper reports, "the United States rejected the use of biological weapons because they are difficult to control and could cause infection on both sides.... Moreover, the existence of such weapons in the United States would encourage small countries to consider their usefulness as a... 'cheap nuclear bomb.'" Now, as Feith has reassured congressmen, these fears would apparently disappear as a result of "striking successes" by the United States. There were no moral obstacles before, nor are there any now. The determining factor, the Pentagon spokesman confirmed, is only "the exceptionally great military importance" of viruses, bacteria, and toxins.

To judge by everything, the statement by the military department's spokesman is a prologue to a scenario, already worked out in the United States, for pushing through new means of destruction. Matters were presented there as if "the Russians are already designing such weapons" and that "the Pentagon is

alarmed." The next American strike is evidently planned against the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons. This convention was spoken of at the subcommittee session as allegedly having "serious shortcomings which do not lead themselves to correction."

Thus we have the first visible symptoms of Washington's "infection" by yet another "superdeadly" mass destruction weapon, a vague idea of which can perhaps be obtained only from medieval accounts of the plague. Formerly it was believed that the prime causes of such "infection" in the world of profits were greed and the readiness to commit any crime under the slogan "the end justifies the means." Now there are obvious signs of insanity.

A struggle to implement the great program for delivering our planet from nuclear weapons by the end of this century is spreading in all continents at present. The Soviet Union, which put this program forward, has taken a new and decisive step by extending the moratorium on nuclear tests with a view to putting an end to any improvements of this terrible tool of annihilation. But the world of gold threatens to bring back to earth the horrors of wholesale death in the Middle Ages. Is there a limit to the perversion of human thinking? Or is there no such thing in a society where every invention by human genius is transformed into an evil for the inhabitants of the earth?

/9738

CSO: 5200/1585

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR REPORTS, COMMENTARY ON GENEVA BW CONFERENCE

IZVESTIYA on Agenda, USSR Stance

PM100807 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Sep 86 Morning edition p 4

[V. Kuznetsov Geneva dispatch: "To Increase the Convention's Effectiveness"]

[Text] Delegations from more than one hundred states which have signed the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction are meeting on Monday 8 September for a second conference to review its effect.

The convention came into force on 26 March 1975 and is generally recognized as a concrete measure in the sphere of limiting the arms race. The signatories to this important international agreement pledged never to develop, produce, stockpile, or otherwise acquire or retain microbial or other biological agents or toxins, whatever their origin or method of production, of types and in quantities that have no justification for prophylactic, productive, or other peaceful purposes.

Thus, one of the most "diabolical means" for the mass destruction of people, the Swiss newspaper LE COURRIER has stressed, is outlawed on the basis of the comprehensive, up-to-date agreement within the UN framework. It has been proven in practice that, despite difficulties and obstacles, it is possible to create an international legal mechanism limiting the arms race.

This mechanism gained approval at the first conference to review the effect of the convention (3-21 March 1980 in Geneva). In the final declaration the participants confirmed their unshakable determination in the interests of humanity to completely rule out the possibility of bacteriological (biological) agents and toxins being used as weapons.

The present conference's agenda covers 14 issues. The plenary sessions and working commissions will examine various aspects of problems connected with the convention's effect and the observance of its provisions. Work will also be continued on the approval of a final document. The Soviet Union ratified the convention on 11 February 1975, -- 2 months before it was signed. This attests to our serious approach and desire to ban this type of mass destruction weapon. Our country -- and this is repeatedly stressed in official documents -- strictly observes all the provisions of the convention.

Research and development in the Soviet Union involving microorganisms and toxins pursues exclusively peaceful aims and is carried out in the interests of public health care, the microbiological industry, and agricultural production. In this connection our country is in favor of building broad international cooperation in the sphere of biotechnology and the peaceful development of biological science.

Prior to the beginning of the conference the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute presented the participants with the research work "Biological and Toxin Weapons Today," which contains an appeal to take additional measures to increase the effectiveness of the convention.

Conference Opens

LD082321 Moscow TASS in English 2037 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Geneva September 8 TASS -- The second conference for analyzing the effect of the convention of the banning of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxic weapons and for their destruction opened here today.

By today the convention had been signed by over 100 countries. This is actually the first document which permitted to take away from the arsenals of the countries a whole class of extremely dangerous mass destruction weapons. The task of the conference is to consolidate the regime of the convention and to promote a further expansion of international cooperation in the sphere of peaceful development of biology and the use of its achievements in the interests of socio-economic, scientific and technological process.

Report on Israelyan Address

LD091305 Moscow TASS in English 1238 GMT 9 Sep 86

[Text] Geneva September 9 TASS -- Tass Correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

A general debate has opened today at the conference to review compliance with the convention on the prohibition of bacteriological weapons.

In a message addressed to the delegates to the conference, Javier Perez de Cuellar, U.N. secretary general, pointed out that "the biological weapons convention constitutes the first and so far the only international legally binding instrument by which states parties have undertaken to prohibit and prevent the development, production and stockpiling of an entire category of weapons of mass destruction. The convention has, therefore, aptly been called the world's first disarmament treaty.

"It continues to serve as a guide to the international community in its efforts to achieve genuine disarmament measures regarding other types of weapons and their systems, it furnishes an example of how mutually acceptable solutions can be found to most intricate international problems".

President of the second review conference -- Winifred Lang (Austria) has called for strengthening the convention as a reliable instrument ensuring the prevention of the arms race in an important field and real disarmament measures.

The Soviet Union sees the main objective of the conference in contributing in every way possible to strengthening the convention and effectively implementing all of its provision, Viktor Israelyan, the head of the Soviet delegation said. This document can serve as an example of a successful resolution of intricate security problems and is evidence that genuine disarmament is not a Utopia, but quite a feasible task. It is part of the complex the head of the Soviet delegation said. This document can serve as an example of a successful resolution of intricate security problems and is evidence that genuine disarmament is not a Utopia, but quite a feasible task. It is part of the complex of the agreements and treaties in effect in the field of limitation of the arms race. It is the direct duty of all states to preserve and increase that complex, in the first place of the states which bear the main responsibility for maintaining peace and international security.

As the USSR representative stressed, the Soviet Union has no bacteriological (biological) agents or toxins, weapons, equipment or delivery vehicles. It strictly abides by all the other articles of the convention. The Soviet Union's research and development with the use of microorganisms and toxins pursues solely peaceful aims and is done in the interests of public health protection and of the microbiological industry and agriculture.

Over the years of its existence, the convention has fully proved its effectiveness and viability. The documents prepared for the session are proof that the provisions of that agreement are universal and capacious and apply to any microorganisms both of natural and artificial origin, which could be viewed as agents of warfare.

In the Soviet Union's opinion, the convention could be strengthened by a further broadening of the circle of participating states, its speediest ratification by the states, which have not yet done so, as well as a further development of international cooperation in the field of peaceful uses of biological science for the benefit of peace and progress.

V. Israelyan also urged the participants in the conference to declare for the speediest completion of the talks on the prohibition and scrapping of chemical weapons.

U.S. 'Fabrications' Condemned

LD092148 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Sep 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The second conference examining the compliance with the Convention on the Ban on Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological, Biological, and Toxic Weapons and Their Destruction started its work in Geneva. [passage omitted]

The Soviet delegation has resolutely condemned the attempts of a U.S. representative to cast aspersions on our side by fabrications about alleged violations of the international convention by Moscow. The USSR has strictly observed and observes all provisions of the document, the head of the Soviet delegation stressed. [passage omitted]

U.S. Position on Ban

LD102325 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 10 Sep 86

[From the "International Dairy" program; Vladimir Tsvetov commentary]

[Text] A conference examining the functioning of the convention banning bacteriological weapons is continuing in Geneva. I want to ask political observer Vladimir Tsvetov to talk about the convention and the attitudes to it of the Soviet Union and the United States. From the first days of the work of the conference, one can already judge the positions of both the countries.

Indeed, the positions of the USSR and the United States have revealed themselves with the utmost clarity. But first I would like to say a few words about the convention itself, the functioning of which presenting is being examined at the conference in Geneva. The convention on banning the development, production, and accumulation of stocks of bacteriological, biological, and toxic weapons and on their destruction, was approved by the UN General Assembly in 1971. The convention went into force in 1975. As yet, this is the sole international legal document which bans an entire class of weapons of mass destruction. Despite the opposition of the United States, the General Assembly succeeded in adopting this document. A not inconsiderable role was played hereby scientists, who, on UN instructions, studied the lethal nature of bacteriological weapons and proved irrefutably that this weaponry, delivered by just one strategic bomber, is able to destroy everything living on an area of 100,000 sq. km.

The Soviet Union rigorously observes the convention. Our country does not have bacteriological, biological, or toxic weaponry, and it is not being developed. This defines the position of the Soviet delegation at the conference in Geneva. It proposes the strengthening of the convention in defining more precisely that its prohibiting clauses should apply to any micro-organisms, of both natural and artificial origin, which could be used as a weapon. Apart from this, the Soviet delegation calls, in the development of the convention, for the expansion of international cooperation in the field of the peaceful use of biological science, for the benefit of the world [mir] and progress.

However the U.S. side has a different position. Having falsely accused the Soviet Union of possessing bacteriological weapons -- there were no facts cited since they do not exist -- the U.S. delegation intends to attempt to strike at the convention itself, which, as the Americans stated, cannot protect against the threat of using bacteriological weapons and is therefore dead. The real cause for such a position lies in the following: If since 1949 and up to the time of the adoption of the convention, the United States conducted 239 atmospheric tests on bacteriological weapons, then after 1971 it did not bring itself to do this, but it continued laboratory development of bacteriological weapons; you see, verification [proverka] of them is not possible.

From time to time the United States took research beyond the confines of laboratories. In 1981, for example, it carried out a secret bacteriological attack on Cuba, spreading dengue fever on the island. In 1982 it used bacteriological weapons against partisans in Guatemala. Now the limits of laboratory work have become cramped for the United States. It wants to have a bacteriological Nevada, side by side with the nuclear one. It is for the sake of this that the United States has come up with the idea of undermining the convention banning bacteriological weapons. You have probably noticed, comrades, that the method for undermining an international legal document is known to you. Indeed, the United States intends by a similar method to abandon the SALT II treaty, which limits strategic weapons, and the treaty on antimissile defense. I think, however, that this time the United States dare not to do this, for otherwise it will set itself against the whole world. The convention will remain alive. The world community will not wish to give up the first and perhaps most effective international document hindering the expansion of the arms race. The convention serves as a convincing example of the fact that states can successfully resolve the problems of security and that real disarmament is not a utopia.

Israelyan, Lowitz Addresses Conference

PM131320 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by unnamed own correspondent: "Switzerland: To Strengthen the Convention in Every Possible Way!"]

[Excerpts] Geneva -- Chairman Vinfrid Lang (Austria) banged his hammer to open the general debate at the Second Conference to Review the Working of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction.

The USSR, V.L. Israelyan, head of the USSR delegation, declared in his speech, sees it as the conference's chief task to help strengthen the convention in every possible way. The convention's significance for peace and international security can hardly be overestimated. Above all, it essentially bans an entire class of very dangerous mass destruction weapons, whose use at any point on the globe could lead under modern conditions to unpredictable consequences.

The Soviet Union, V.L. Israelyan pointed out, does not possess any bacteriological (biological) agents or toxins or carry out research and development aimed at creating [sozdaniye] and improving these weapons. It has never passed bacteriological (biological) agents, toxins, weapons, or delivery vehicles to anyone or encouraged any states to produce them or to acquire them by any other means.

Research and development in the Soviet Union involving the use of microorganisms and toxins pursues exclusively peaceful ends and is carried out in the interests of health care, the microbiological industry, and agricultural production.

The speech by Donald Lowitz, head of the U.S. delegation, sounded a sharply dissonant note. After rattling off the standard phrases about support for the convention, the American delegate tried to accuse the Soviet Union of nonexistent violations of its provisions, dragging out onto the rostrum the stories of "yellow rain" in Southeast Asia which have been refuted by the international community.

He also pursued this line at the press conference held after his speech. But his replies to questions even from American correspondents showed that the U.S. envoy muddles up his facts and is incompetent on questions of bacteriological weapons, as evidenced by his admission that he has not read the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute's authoritative studies refuting the U.S. Administration's propaganda fabrications.

"How do you assess that speech?" I put this question to Linda Bullard, an observer at the conference for U.S. public organizations.

"American officials," she replied, "must adduce proof of their version or totally cease the needless ballyhoo over accusations. They only discredit the serious work of strengthening the convention. And it must be strengthened, for the Pentagon uses any loopholes to conduct dangerous experiments with bacteriological weapons."

A recent statement by Douglas Feith, U.S. deputy assistant secretary of defense, attests that these weapons have entered the Pentagon's arsenal. He rained down attacks on the convention, clearly pursuing the aim of torpedoing it and unleashing a biological weapons race. Last year alone the Pentagon conducted approximately 75 experiments in the sphere of genetic engineering, spending more than \$68 million on it.

Alekseyev Commentary

OW120803 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0200 GMT 11 Sep 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; Sergey Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] Currently, a second conference is being held in Switzerland to examine the effectiveness of the convention to ban the development, manufacture, and stockpiling of bacteriological and chemical weapons and their elimination. Our commentary:

[Alkeskeyev] Hello comrades. One of the main efforts in the struggle against the arms race and in reducing the dangers of war is directed at banning bacteriological and chemical weapons. An honest, constructive approach -- an approach which has little in common with the one being taken in the first days of the aforementioned forum in Switzerland by a number of Western participants, above all, by the United States -- is needed for an expedient solution to this problem.

The United States representative's speech at the conference consisted almost entirely of unsubstantiated accusations against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Allegedly, during its entire 14-year existence, the Soviet Union has violated the convention by constantly increasing bacteriological and chemical weapons stockpiles. These are reportedly being used in Afghanistan, Laos, and Cambodia. This was stated in spite of the fact that the Soviet Union, together with other socialist countries, as far back as 1969, was the first to offer to include the question of the complete ban of chemical and bacteriological weapons in the U.N. General Assembly agenda and introduced the draft of the corresponding international convention.

This happened despite the fact -- often proved by, among others, various United Nations commissions which visited Afghanistan and Southeast Asia -- that Washington's assertion that Soviet chemical weapons are being used is unjustified. And, this occurred at a time when the U.S. chemical warfare in Indochina -- the negative ramifications of which are still felt to this very day -- is still vividly remembered.

6 October 1986

Why was it necessary for the U.S. representative in Geneva to yet again drag out the old, and much belabored fraud, which all people, including most Americans, are tired of hearing about? First of all, this is the same old attempt to somehow justify its own chemical warfare preparations. This year, the Pentagon was allocated a record \$10 billion for this. There is one more implication: The United States today is striving, by all means available, to divert the attention of the world from our latest peace initiative -- the extension of the nuclear test moratorium. That is why they are heaping mounds of lies and slander.

U.S. Claims Regarded

PM171522 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Sep 86 First Edition p 3

[A. Golts article: "Why a Lie Is Being Resurrected"]

[Text] An unusual exhibition is currently on show in Washington. Fakes of pictures by famous artists are on display. It is a pity, however, that the organizers of this exhibition have confined themselves to fakes in the sphere of art. After all, plenty of fakes are fabricated in the United States in other spheres. Take international affairs. The falsifications fabricated by the CIA, the Pentagon, and the State Department could fill a museum. Among them a special place could be claimed by the numerous insinuations about "Soviet yellow rain."

This malicious lie has surfaced, once again, in the speech of the U.S. representative at the second conference being held in Geneva to examine the operation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxic Weapons and on Their Destruction.

Why was it necessary to resurrect this old calumny? All it is an unconcealed attempt to shift the blame. Under the auspices of the Pentagon, numerous laboratories and scientific centers have long been working in the United States, allegedly on developing methods to protect troops against bacteriological weapons. In effect, experiments with new types of morbid micro-organisms are conducted at these establishments. This year alone the Pentagon has allocated 4.3 million dollars for a special center for toxin research at Jefferson University. At the same time a laboratory is being set up at the Army proving ground at Dugway.

Furthermore, there are numerous indications that the United States has already used "silent death" in its subversive operations against sovereign states. The epidemic of "dengue" fever which affected thousands of Cubans in 1981 was the result of a subversive U.S. operation. This was proved by much scientific data and the testimony of the mercenaries who carried out this crime. E. Arocena, one of the ringleaders of the Omega-7 counterrevolutionary organization, while on trial in New York for murder, told of participating in this sinister operation. During the same year, 1981, (Nlin), a U.S. biologist, was expelled from Pakistan in connection with a scandal which broke over sinister experiments with virus-infected mosquitoes that he had conducted in that country.

6 October 1986

At present research in preparation for bacteriological warfare has entered a new stage in the United States. Feith, a ranking Pentagon official, stated this quite plainly while speaking in Congress. "It is now absolutely clear," he trumpeted, "that bacteriological weapons manufactured with recourse to the latest technology could acquire extraordinarily great military importance. We have changed our view about the military usefulness of bacteriological weapons. Bacteriological weapons could become truly great."

If this is true, Washington should spare no effort to reinforce the convention banning the production and stockpiling of bacteriological weapons. However, far from it! On the eve of the conference articles have appeared in the U.S. press in which unnamed U.S. representatives claimed that the convention is "useless." According to THE WASHINGTON TIMES one of them even declared that it is "impossible to ensure effective verification of the observance of this convention."

And to corroborate this the old lie about "yellow rain" was dragged out again. The logic is highly characteristic of Washington's thinking: "If we cannot prove that Russian toxin weapons are being used in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan, it means that the convention is ineffective."

4 Of late the United States has resorted to similar tricks more than once. So, for instance, to begin with there was talk about the SALT II treaty being "flawed," then far-fetched accusations were made claiming that the USSR was violating the treaty. But soon it became clear that Washington itself had decided to violate the treaty. Judging by appearances, the efforts to undermine the convention banning bacteriological weapons pursue the same aim.

And it is highly illustrative that Washington is trying to discredit a document which would essentially ban a whole class of highly dangerous mass annihilation weapons, a document which could serve as an example of the successful solution of complex problems in the sphere of security.

Addressing the conference, the Soviet representative noted that the USSR has no bacteriological weapons at all. Our country adheres strictly to all the articles of the convention and seeks to strengthen it. As for the spurious report about Soviet "yellow rain," (J. Lenard), head of the U.S. delegation to the talks which led to the conclusion of the convention, expressed himself pertinently on the subject. He described U.S. conduct in this respect as disgraceful. "It is our duty as parties to the convention," he emphasized, "not to raise accusations that cannot be proved." It is high time for Washington to heed this kind of sober view.

'Far-Fetched Accusations'

LD182116 Moscow TASS in English 1909 GMT 18 Sep 86

[Text] Geneva, 18 Sep (TASS)--TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

The general debate has ended here at the current conference to review the implementation of the Convention on the Ban on Bacteriological (Biological Weapons).

During the debate almost all the participants pointed out the great importance of the convention and said that it was essential to treat carefully the first measure of real disarmament and to contribute to consolidating the convention and to effective implementation of all its provisions.

The participants in the debate in the same way unanimously spoke out in favour of imposing a ban on chemical weapons as soon as possible.

However, one is getting the impression that such a positive attitude of mind at the conference is not to the liking of individual delegations and, first of all, that of the United States.

At the very beginning of the work, Donald Lowitz, the leader of the U.S. delegation, stated his "concern" with regard to the observance of the convention. He did not give any facts or proofs which would justify the "concern" -- for the simple reason that such do not exist.

Nevertheless, subsequently, U.S. representatives and some of their closest allies went further along the lines of far-fetched accusations levelled at the Soviet Union for alleged violations of the main clauses of the convention.

The delegation of the USSR categorically rejected the accusations that are an invention from beginning to end and pursue the aim of aggravating the situation at the conference and at using it to fan up anti-Soviet propaganda.

The Soviet delegation again showed its readiness for a joint search for mutually acceptable solution and, with due regard for other delegations' wishes concerning the consolidation of the control machinery, submitted a proposal to work out and adopt an additional protocol to the convention. Such a protocol would envisage measures to invigorate the system of control.

Viktor Israelyan, the leader of the USSR delegation, voiced conviction that those who are really interested in raising the effectiveness of the convention, and not in spreading every kind of fables, would support the proposal.

Talks With UK Delegation

LD182124 Moscow TASS in English 1923 GMT 18 Sep 86

[Text] London September 18 TASS -- Soviet-British consultations were held today in connection with the talks on elaborating a convention on banning and destroying stockpiles of chemical weapons

The Soviet delegation was headed by Yu. Nazarkin, head of a USSR Foreign Ministry department. The delegation met with Tim Renton, British minister of state, Foreign and Commonwealth office.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1585

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

IZVESTIYA: REPORT ON USE OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS BY DRA REBELS

PM101230 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Sep 86 Morning Edition pp 1, 4

[Own correspondent D. Meshchaninov dispatch: "Afghanistan: Poisoners of Wells. The West Supplies the Dushmans With Chemical Weapons"]

[Text] Kabul -- The Western special services are supplying the Afghan counterrevolutionary rabble not only with conventional but also with chemical weapons. Tangible proof of this is provided by exhibits at the display of material captured by the DRA Armed Forces in Kabul, Lowgar, and Vardak Provinces in literally the last few days. They include larger-caliber machine guns and submachine guns, mortars and grenades, shells of different calibers, and antiaircraft missiles including British "Blue Point" surface-to-air type missiles. A special type of weapon is also among them: Various kinds of mines and grenades charged with toxins.

Chemical weapons started reaching the dushmans from across the border with Pakistan in 1980, Colonel Mohammad Nazem, chief of the DRA Defense Ministry Chemical Service, said. Gangs armed with U.S. -made CS gas grenades were first reported in the vicinity of Herat in March of that year. A month later these very same grenades, similar to tin cans in appearance, were used by dushmans in Herat itself against people's militia staffers.

Soon after the rout of a gang led by Alia Kayvan, known by the nickname Gonda -- Phalange -- in the region of Khovst, unusual pencil boxes containing 30 gray tablets each were discovered in secret caches. It was established that they were made of the powerful toxic substance "Phostoxin," designed to poison water sources and to contaminate foodstuffs. It is obvious that Gonda did not acquire the tablets from some peddler in Peshawar's "black market." The poison was made by professional "chemists" in the United States, evidence of which was provided by the packaging and the markings on the pencil boxes.

In 1982 the dushmans used toxins to commit a disgusting atrocity in the capital. About 100 young girls, students at a lyceum in the capital, were brought to a Kabul hospital suffering from acute poisoning. It was ascertained that the bandits had demanded that they boycott their studies and, when this did not happen, had poured poison into the school's drinking water tanks. Fourteen girls died a painful death and dozens more remained invalids for life. I was well aware of this terrorist action. I asked whether there have been any instances of toxins being used in combat.

There have been some cases, M. (Nazem) replied. For example, Colonel Rahmatullah's unit was subjected to direct chemical attack in Nangarhar Province in 1984. In an attempt to break out of encirclement, the gang released four mines charged with toxins. The dushmans failed to breakout, but several fighters from Rahmatullah's subunit were affected. Their symptoms were weeding, asphyxia, violent retching, and loss of hearing within approximately 1 hour -- typical symptoms of a chemical strike.

It was in 1984 that mines, grenades, and bullets charged with chemical substances started arriving in Pakistan from the United States and some other Western countries in larger quantities than before, according to testimony by former counterrevolutionaries who voluntarily switched to the side of the people's government. The weapons were later sent on to Afghanistan, where they were intended to be used both against the DRA Armed Forces and against the civilian population.

Furthermore, counterrevolutionary leaders entrenched in Pakistan demanded that their "fighters" sent to Afghanistan not only use chemical weapons but also gather factual data on the results of their use. Photographs of the victims of toxins, tape recordings of eyewitness testimony, and samples of contaminated water and soil were to be sent back to Peshawar. In order to obtain more detailed and convincing "data," the dushmans were instructed not to spare the civilian population.

The counterrevolution was thus planning not only to damage Afghanistan's national economy and population, but also to present its own crimes as "incontrovertible proof" of the use of toxins by the Afghan Army and the Limited Contingent of Soviet Troops. The bandits' leaders have not abandoned these plans even now. Evidence of this can be seen in the chemical weapons captured during recent combat operations and in documents in the possession of DRA State Security organs.

Rabbani, leader of the "Islamic Association of Afghanistan," is displeased with the fact that his subordinates in Herat Province have hitherto failed to supply evidence of the use of toxins by the Afghan Army and the Soviet forces. But where is this evidence to be found when it simply does not exist. On the other hand, there is plentiful evidence that the counterrevolutionaries are being supplied with modern chemical weapons. The captured materiel stamped "Made in"...the United States, Britain, and the FRG offers tangible evidence against those who are behind the dushmans.

While one of the most topical questions of our time -- the banning and destruction of chemical weapons -- is being discussed both in the United Nations and at other international forums, the United States and some other Western countries are supplying these deadly weapons to the dushmans, who are waging an undeclared war against their own people.

Such is the truth, and no "tribunals," "hearings," and "trials" of the DRA, organized for the purpose of falsifying the facts, can cover up the Western countries' complicity in the use of chemical weapons in Afghanistan or hide the truth from the broad strata of the international public.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1585

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

IZVESTIYA RIDICULES ANGOLA CW CHARGE

PM151901 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 4

[B. Pilyatskin commentary: "Black Leaves and Black Conscience"]

[Text] Goebbels, the super-specialist in disinformation, loved to repeat: "A list must be monstrous for it to be believed." Times change, but the morals of the "well poisoners" remain the same. From the tropical Angolan jungle American ABC television correspondent J. Hickey has sent a heart-chilling SOS: the people of Jonas Savimbi, leader of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) detachments, are being poisoned.

No, not this time by newspaper epithets, which have long been tightly latched onto the cutthroats who murder innocent Angolan citizens. The rebels are being poisoned, as it transpires, in the literal sense of the word--by chemical bombs. What has Angola gotten them from? Directly from Moscow, of course. "Savimbi," the American commentator reports from his den in the forest, "is accusing the Soviet Union of supplying Angola--where Marxists are in power--with toxic substances."

Whenever Angolan subunits strike another perceptible blow against UNITA, which is on the payroll of the CIA and the Republic of South Africa (RSA), Savimbi looks for "explanation" to justify himself before his chiefs, who generously supply him with everything he needs. Either he had to lay down his arms because it was raining, or, conversely, drought was the impediment--the savanna burned down and there was nowhere to hide.

On this occasion in the Angolan Army's successful operations against UNITA the object of blame is... the black leaves on the trees. The terrorist chemicals, of course, have infallibly determined that the leaves have turned this color solely because "the Russians are using chemical weapons against our fighters." It would appear that it is precisely because of these leaves that these "fighters" are fleeing the battlefield and giving themselves up.

The fact that the UNITA chief is engaging in shameless fabrication and poisoning the international atmosphere with his stories is part of the normal course of events. What is surprising is something else: the fact that certain American mass information media are so blinded by malice toward revolutionary Angola and its friends that they publicly relish the alchemist's brew about chemical bombs.

Nevertheless, in order to give some semblance of objectivity to his report, the ABM correspondent concluded it with the words: "However, he (Savimbi) has not provided any evidence of chemical poisoning." Nevertheless, the American television company has poisoned the air with another dose of slander....

/9738

CSO: 5200/1585

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

PRC PEOPLE'S DAILY ON SOVIET PEACE EFFORTS IN CDE

HK170345 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 13 Sep 86 p 6

["Roundup" by Reporter Gu Yaoming: "Conditional Concessions Cannot Cover Up the Contention"]

[Excerpts] The final round of talks at the European Disarmament Conference in Stockholm will conclude on 19 September. With this date drawing near, people are paying more attention to the state of the conference which has lasted for 2 and 1/2 years. [passage omitted]

In view of European countries' general desire for peace and disarmament, the Soviet Union has launched an extensive peace offensive against the United States. [paragraph continues]

At the Stockholm meeting, the Soviets have also shown a tolerant attitude which was different from their previous attitude. They have made a series of concessions in the past 2 months. To prevent itself from being put in a passive position, the United States has also made some concessions. The United States has agreed to inform the Warsaw Pact about the movements of U.S. troops from its own territory to Western Europe; while the Soviet Union has expressed its willingness to allow the other side to inspect its territory for military activities. These two points were the most knotty issues at the previous talks. Participants are now glad to see that the two countries can reach a compromise on these questions. According to some participants in the conference, the meeting will achieve some results on issues such as exchanging information about the movement of troops and military exercises, inviting military observers to inspect sites, and exchanging plans for military activities.

However, the optimistic atmosphere in the conference hall cannot cover the existence of serious differences between the United States and the Soviet Union on many other issues. Although the meeting is almost over the two sides have not stopped blaming each other. According to the state of affairs which has been made public, the two sides still hold different opinions on concrete measures for the issues on which they have reached a compromise in principle. For example, although the Soviet Union agreed with spot inspections, it still insisted that foreign observers must ride in a plane or vehicle provided by the side subject to the inspection, and move within a limited area. The NATO countries are strongly averse to such arrangements. They hold that spot inspections will only play into Soviet hands. As another example, although the United States agreed to inform the Warsaw Pact about the movement of its troops, the

scale of the information offered did not meet the requirements of the Warsaw Pact. As some observers pointed out, the concessions made by the Soviet Union and the United States are very limited, and they are only trying to gain an advantageous position in the European disarmament forum in light of their own strategies.

People believe that it will be a good thing if the European Disarmament Conference in Stockholm finally reaches some agreements, but the agreements cannot cover the existing contention between the United States and the Soviet Union.

/9738

CSO: 5200/4076

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S., WORLD RESPONSE TO GORBACHEV RUDE PRAVO REPLIES

Western Reports Faulted

LD091710 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 9 Sep 86

["Political observer" Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] Among the first comments published in connection with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies to questions of the RUDE PRAVO newspaper, attention is drawn to the summaries of this important document by certain Western, especially U.S. and West German, news agencies. The most significant thing about these summaries, perhaps, is not what they contain but what they omit. Paradoxical as this may seem, the word moratorium does not appear at all in many of these reports. Yes, indeed, that same moratorium on all nuclear explosions which the Soviet Union has extended for the fourth time and to which most of the RUDE PRAVO questions are devoted.

If one gets one's information only from the reports of some Western agencies, then one could get the impression that there is no such moratorium and never has been. These agencies focus all their attention merely on the problem of a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

Without question, this is an important problem. And Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev once again pointed out that we are in favor of holding such a meeting, a meeting that would signify a considerable advance in solving at least one or two vital problems of international security.

But what sort of position is Washington adopting on this issue? Les Aspin, a leading U.S. congressman -- he heads the Armed Services Committee in Congress -- made an apt remark the other day: White House policy in this field is on two different levels: One consists of flowery statements about the need for arms reduction which are never backed up by deeds. The other consists of demands for newer and newer armaments which are always backed up by actions.

Indeed, following the congressman's statement, there were two more actions of this nature: The latest -- the 19th since the Soviet moratorium -- a nuclear explosion in Nevada, and a further U.S. antisatellite weapon testing.

One might ask: Can this be preparation for a new summit meeting? But, if one deliberately proceeds from the standpoint that the moratorium is unacceptable to the U.S. side, if it is blocking the issue of medium-range missiles in Europe, if strategic armaments must be built up -- then what is left on which to reach an agreement? How to

use a summit meeting to reassure the public and deceive people? Such a meeting would scarcely be of benefit.

All this is referred to in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies to RUDE PRAVO, just as is the fact that, notwithstanding all the provocations, we are not slamming the door. But, in my opinion, one must point out what are at least the inaccuracies in the summaries of these replies by the Western news agencies which pride themselves so much on their objectivity.

VREMYA Roundup

LD102114 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 10 September in its "Vremya" newscast carries a 9-minute "Studio-20" discussion chaired by Aleksandr Serikov, with correspondent Vladimir Dmitriyev reporting from Geneva; Yevgeniy Shirokov from Budapest; Vladimir Kondratyev from Bonn; and Vladimir Dunayev from Washington. The program deals with public reaction to the replies by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to questions from the editor-in-chief of RUDE PRAVO.

Dmitriyev reports that there has been favorable reaction at the Geneva conference on bacteriological weapons. He says the reaction of the socialist and developing countries was extremely positive. An anonymous official from the U.S. State Department said he had not read the answers. Another member of the U.S. delegation, a chemical weapons expert working for the Pentagon, said he had read the answers carefully and described them as "very interesting." Dmitriyev says that if the United States takes concrete action in response, the general process of disarmament will benefit.

Yevgeniy Shirokov reports from Budapest on the Hungarian reaction. He interviews people in the street who say that the USSR is making a serious contribution to the struggle for peace by declaring a moratorium on nuclear tests.

Vladimir Kondratyev reports on reaction in Bonn, where there is great interest, he says. He criticizes the government for saying that a reduction of nuclear arsenals must precede a moratorium. He says that is tantamount to legalizing underground tests, an approach that was exposed in Gorbachev's interview.

Serikov says that in one of the replies to RUDE PRAVO, it was stated that the United States is whipping up artificial optimism about the forthcoming summit, on the one hand, and trying in effect, to substitute talk of a meeting for all the pressing problems involved in curbing the arms race, on the other. He asks Dunayev for examples of this.

Dunayev reports: "Aboard the aircraft on which the U.S. President was returning from his holidays yesterday, his press secretary summoned journalists and told them--I quote--the summit meeting will be productive if the Soviet side wants it to be productive. This was the White House's reaction to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's interview with RUDE PRAVO.

"Well, you can read what you like into that reaction. Even the Delphi oracle was not so vague! The leading article in THE WASHINGTON POST made a good point: Nuclear tests are like a car's ignition. Switch it off and the engine of the arms race will stop running. But there are people who are very keen to see this engine running, to see it going, working."

"In the same newspaper, Ellen Goodman wrote: Moscow is in favor of halting tests, the U.S. people are in favor of halting tests. It is only the White House that wants them to continue. Well, that is slightly over-simplified because a large number of Americans do not know very much about all this. But, in general, if you ask Americans whether they are for testing or against it, the overwhelming majority will, of course, say that they are against testing. That is how opinions are divided."

"Soviet initiatives have not passed unnoticed. That applies not just to West Europe and progressive circles, so to speak, in America, but to the U.S. people as a whole and even to the U.S. Congress. During the past 12 months the impact has accumulated, so to speak. It has increased. One result of this has been a resolution by the U.S. House of Representatives in which it decided to cut off funds for U.S. nuclear tests, effective from 1 January next year."

11 Sep Talk Show

LD112358 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1820 GMT 11 Sep 86

["The Time for Solutions" program, presented by international affairs writer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, with ZYCIE WARSZAWY journalist Andrzej Bajorek, NEPSZABADSAG journalist Peter Dunai, and Stefan Babiak, Prague Radio correspondent in Moscow, all speaking in Russian; video shows Shishlin and the three participants seated at a table in the studio]

[Text] [Shishlin] Hello, comrades. I want first of all to introduce those taking part in our discussion today. Andrzej represents the Polish newspaper ZYCIE WARSZAWY -- Andrzej Bajorek. Peter Dunai represents the Hungarian paper NEPSZABADSAG, and Stefan Babiak works as the representative of Prague radio here in Moscow.

Well, as you will have guessed, the subject we will be talking about today is the recent replies of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to questions from the chief editor of RUDE PRAVO, Zdenek Horeni. Naturally, these replies convey clearly the consistent and principled course of the Soviet State toward overcoming the danger of war and curtailing the arms race. However, one of the arguments resorted to by the opponents of the Soviet moratorium is this: They say, well, a moratorium's all very fine, but what the world is actually facing is a string of highly complex problems which are also awaiting a solution; in particular, there's the problem of reducing strategic armaments, abolition of chemical weapons. A multitude of problems that could be mentioned. But the moratorium is the first and most indispensable step toward calling a halt. The more so since the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are not in any way turning their backs on the other burning international questions, but are, on the contrary, proposing entirely reasonable compromise formulas for settling them.

What stands out in the replies of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is his strict realistic assessment of the actions, not only of those forces that advocate the creation of a radically healthier international political climate, but also of the opponents of the policy of easing tension, of the policy of reviving the process of detente. This seems to me to be the vitally important problem: Why, when the world is in such danger, when there are all these underwater reefs and rocks seemingly so plainly indicated on the political map of the world, does the United States continue to pursue its routine policy of force? In your opinion, Andrezej, what is the reason for this?

[Bajorek] Of course, it is not enough to say that they don't want disarmament. One has to look at what the dominant motivation are in present U.S. policy; and Mikhail Sergeyevich's interviews gives answers to these very questions. It clarifies many problems in, I would say, quite simple language. We're all asking ourselves this question: Why does the other side not want to accept disarmament? Why do they want to test new weapons, instead of stopping? And I think that in the light of the interview and in the light of what we can observe every day when we read the papers and listen to the commentaries of the political commentators, it's obvious that they want to arm us for death [as heard] They...

[Shishlin, interrupting, corrects Bajorek's Russian] Arm to death.

[Bajorek] ...to death. Strange as it may seem, they don't want us to be disarmed and in some sense, you might say, weaker; on the contrary, they want us to arm ourselves to the point where we have no possibility of doing anything other than that.

[Shishlin] Yes, I think possibly I'd agree with that. That's pretty much what they're aiming for -- to exhaust the socialist countries morally and give them no chance to get on with their constructive tasks. What do you think, Peter?

[Dunai] I have the impression that the United States wants us to choose the path that they have already chosen. By that I mean militarization of the economy. That's what will happen in the United States. Now we can see how they [pauses] as far as influence is concerned, in political and military circles, is growing. [as heard] And my meaning is this; if they wanted to compete with us peacefully, perhaps they would not win. I mean, for example, that the profits of those vast militarist enterprises such as Boeing, or MacDonald Douglas are thousands per cent. There was that scandal recently -- 1 or 2 years ago, when the U.S. Congress -- the accountants carried out a check, and discovered that, in one swindle, the contractors had added to their bill, say \$500, or \$600 [figures as heard] -- that's a huge amount of money.

[Shishlin] Yes, but besides swindles, they also unfortunately do more serious things, and for those things a still higher price has to be paid. The bill runs, of course, to hundreds of billions of dollars, and the present administration has spent, during its term in office, something like a trillion dollars on the arms race. [Bajorek] Yes, they have the money and they hope we haven't, or not enough; that if we arm ourselves, we'll have no money for other expenditure.

[Babiak] I think a very important point in the U.S. calculation is that the Americans are, after all, trying to achieve military superiority; and I consider that the main motive among all those that at present determine U.S. policy, even though it's common knowledge that these U.S. actions have very dangerous consequences for the world community. They make for feverish international relations. They remove the limitations fixed by a treaty -- take off the brakes -- in the sphere of the arms race. They exacerbate the global problems that now agitate the whole world. I think

the U.S. does not want -- not that it can not, it simply does not want -- to understand the very simple logic that the more arms there are, the more distrust; and the more distrust there is, the more probable it becomes that all these armaments will be used, and there will be a great disaster from which there will be no escape. This reminds me of an interesting thought that was expressed back in the 18th century by British publicist and philosopher Edmund Burke. He said that great powers and weak minds were incompatible; and his words take on a special significance in our time, when not only the fate of kingdoms and states but the destiny of the entire human race depends upon the intellect and sense of responsibility of statesmen.

[Bajorek] Yes, but I would like to add something: I agree with what you say, but I should like to make the point that this involves not just the great powers. It involves all states, peoples and societies. For instance, we represent the European countries here. We must say that this course toward the arms race is not just aimed at getting the Soviet Union to arm itself: they intend that we -- Poland, and your country [CSSR] and Hungary -- should also arm ourselves proportionately. They know, moreover, that we have certain economic difficulties, and they are applying all the more pressure now, no doubt because they sense that we shall surmount these difficulties with time and we will find things easier.

4 [Shishlin] You know, we cannot say, by and large, that we have been particularly lucky when it comes to U.S. presidents and administrations. But all the same I was just thinking that in the seventies we did manage to conclude the interim 1972 agreement on the limitation of strategic armaments. We also managed to agree on SALT II, although the treaty failed to be ratified by the U.S. Senate. The ABM Treaty of indefinite validity was concluded. There were agreements of some kind. But just look at the foreign policy luggage of the present U.S. Administration. As we've already said here, we find just-destroyed agreements, and the present administration has not managed to work out a single sensible and serious agreement on the key problems of international security, either with us or with any other country. It seems to me in this context that, of course, problems do arise. And it is with good reason that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU central Committee, refers in his replies [as heard] to the question of what attitude to adopt to the present administration, and rejects the viewpoint that one cannot get on with this administration, and that one can wait 2 and 1/2 years, a new administration will come to power and everything will be alright.

[Bajorek] Naturally, what you don't do today you won't make up for tomorrow.

[Shishlin] Yes, and this is all the more so in that the nuclear age is indeed, as has been said rather dramatically, a short-lived one. But let us just hope that the nuclear age will be followed by a nuclear-free future. And in this regard I think, Andrzej, that it is very correct to say that the problem of the arms race, the surmounting of the arms race, really does involve all countries, irrespective of the size of these countries and irrespective of the location of these countries, whether it be Europe, Asia, Africa or Latin America. In other words, these are truly international problems, and from this point of view it seems to me to be worth paying attention to the question of what role other states can play here in solving these problems which are on the agenda when it comes to Soviet-U.S. relations, and on the agenda of world politics.

[Bajorek] It seems to me that this role is a very considerable one. Although we do not play a direct part in negotiations, by shaping our policies in a particular direction we support one tendency and oppose another. From Poland's point of view,

peace is very important. We lost so much in the last world war. As you well know, Poland lost 6 million people. In proportion to the whole population, this is an enormous figure.

[Shishlin] Yes, it is simply a monstrous figure.

[Bajorek] Now there are other problems. We now have to consider the longer term. And I would say that we feel instinctively that we Poles greatly need cooperation, an atmosphere of peace, a good atmosphere in Europe. There is no need for me to mention that in certain military plans of the generals on the other side of the Atlantic that the Vistula is the place to draw the line. They believe that some imaginary Westward campaign by Soviet troops must be halted somewhere along the Vistula. It must be said that the word halt sounds...

[Shishlin interrupts] Almost innocent!

[Bajorek] ...It doesn't sound so bad. What it really means is the destruction of 37 million Poles making this land a desert, perhaps forever.

[Dunai] If I may, I should like to express the following thought: Europe is very small in the geographical sense. A news conference was held in Moscow recently, at which Comrade Falin said that it is now 6 minutes to 12. What does this mean in practice. It means that if you take, for instance, the territory of the FRG -- they have Pershings, Pershing II's -- for the Pershing II's there are just 6 minutes, 6,7, or 8 minutes from launch to target, in another part of Europe. This is a terribly short space. We are literally sitting on a bomb here in Europe. That is why we have to...

[Shishlin interrupts] If anyone is sitting on a bomb it is West Germany, where there are 5,000 nuclear warheads.

[Dunai] Yes, quite so. And we have other problems, common problems. Take water. If the water is polluted in the FRG or Austria, we will be affected, and so will Romania, Yugoslavia, and the Soviet Union. It also works the other way round. This means that the customs officials, the border guards cannot stop the polluted water, or...

[Shishlin interrupts] Or polluted air.

[Dunai] ... or polluted air. And we have one common European value above all: security. We need security more than, for instance, other parts of the world, because so much is located in such close proximity here.

[Shishlin] Yes, and things are too fragile; everything is crowded, everything is near to everything else.

[Babiak] But this does not just apply to Europe.

[Shishlin] of course not.

[Babiak] We are saying that this has a direct bearing on us. This goes without saying. This problem is fraught with much danger. But this problem of war and peace, as embodied in the question of halting nuclear tests, is a subject discussed throughout the world. For instance, the Nonaligned Movement conference ended in Harare, the Zimbabwean capital, just the other day. The conference began with the moratorium issue, and the issue is also touched on in the final documents. The appeal to Mikhail

Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan which was adopted by the conference participants, says precisely that the arms race must be halted because the danger of mankind's self-destruction is greater than ever before. The call for a moratorium and the call for a resolution of these problems were made with good reason, although the developing countries have a very large number of other problems which they need to tackle urgently.

There is another aspect: the recent actions of the Delhi Six. They consist not just of appeals, but concrete measures to try to achieve a ban on nuclear tests as soon as possible. The meeting of experts of the Delhi Six, the Soviet Union and the United States on the issue of the monitoring a ban on nuclear blasts is a concrete example of action, since the group of six is becoming an authoritative arbiter in the controversy about whether nuclear tests can be halted and monitored, something about which, if I am not mistaken, only Washington today has doubts.

[Shishlin] Yes, and you no doubt also noticed, Stefan, that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies contain a serious new idea on monitoring: the creation of an international, supranational system.

[Babiak] Yes, and the Delhi Six are in fact proposing a concrete framework for implementing their own possibilities and the possibilities existing today in other countries throughout the world to monitor seriously everything that may affect the observance of a ban, or a treaty or agreement banning nuclear tests. So I think that it really is a worldwide problem, and if you consider the reactions that have appeared throughout the world to the extension of the Soviet moratorium from 6 August to the end of this year, or rather to 1 January of next year, then I would not hesitate to call this a world plebiscite on the question whose results are self-evident.

[Shishlin] Yes, I think that a new thinking is, albeit with difficulty, overcoming the force of inertia and making headway in international affairs, particularly, As we all of course know very well, the moratorium is the first and very important step, although the agenda of world politics includes other problems, too.

[Bajorek] It is, so to speak, the key, because everything starts with it, and it provides the possibility for solving all the other problems. If we do not create new weapons, then the weapons that we have now will, of course, become outdated, just as old aircraft or old tanks do. Then we will have the possibility, the conditions, for saying farewell to those weapons altogether.

[Shishlin] Of course, and what is sometimes unfortunately forgotten -- I say unfortunately because certain political circles in the West actually make a point of forgetting it -- is that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in no way limit themselves to the sole idea of banning nuclear tests and nothing more. We want to go further, to cover strategic weapons, medium-range weapons, and conventional weapons. So in this sea of problems that the world today is up against there really is one key one: that of stopping the arms race, and then going into reverse. Listening as I did, carefully, to what you have been saying, one can see yet again that whatever problem you take, be it environmental protection, energy, or aid to undeveloped countries, it all hinges on overcoming the arms race, because it is not just a waste; it is a dangerous waste, which really may lead to the nuclear abyss.

[Bajorek] And it creates the climate, too: It is impossible to solve the supplementary questions if this question number one is not going to be solved and is going to be put aside.

[Shishlin] Yes, and you know I would like to turn to our viewers and draw their attention to something that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in his replies to the chief editor of RUDE PRAVO. It concerns the socialist countries, and this is what Mikhail Sergeyevich wrote: I should like to stress in particular that we value very highly and scrupulously take into account the opinions of our allies. We are fully resolved to continue to improve the mechanism and methods of consultation and jointly draw up the foreign policy of socialism. We place a high value on the political initiatives of our allies and friends, their vigor in the struggle for a new political thinking, and their active and equal participation in the common efforts to solve problems of peace, security and disarmament.

I think that if you look at the facts, then 1986 is a uniquely remarkable year for the foreign policy activity of the socialist countries, and in this respect Poland is in one of the front lines I think. Is this so, Andrzej?

[Bajorek] Poland is now becoming more active with regard to its foreign policy. After the events in the early 1980's, with which we are all familiar, it was not so active as it had been during the postwar decades, but the Polish Government has been able to overcome the attempts to isolate Poland on the international scene, and Poland, as a meeting place for various political leaders and politicians, is once again playing a role. Of course the chief direction for us is to strengthen our links with the fraternal socialist countries. Of this there can be no doubt, because in both ideology and economics this is our chief platform of action. But at the same time we are trying to improve relations with the West European countries.

As you know, Comrade Wojciech Jaruzelski intends soon to go to China, and the world situation will probably be a subject of his talks in Beijing. China, you know, is also a nuclear country, and China's joining this course of disarmament could play a very great role. So Poland is trying to take a more active part in all the processes which further peace and cooperation among all countries, regardless of their social systems.

[Shishlin] Hungary, too, has traditionally always had very developed links, particularly through its economy, but also through its political style, has it not?

[Dunai] This year, as I think you will agree, we had an event of the very greatest importance: the Warsaw Pact conference and the call from Budapest for disarmament in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Aside from that we have concentrated this year on Europe. For example, our premier visited the GDR in September, then Australia...

[Shishlin interrupts]...Where, incidentally, there will soon be a big meeting as part of the pan-European process.

[Dunai] Yes, in Vienna, and we are working very actively to ensure that this meeting will be a success. We have also held many international conferences. In July, for example, we had a meeting of scientists against nuclear weapons, a very important international forum.

[Babiak] Your quotation from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's interview for RUDE PRAVO show not only the line that should develop in our countries' policy, but also the trend that exists today -- that of intensifying international efforts by the socialist countries, not only efforts to coordinate our peace advance, but also as part of our defense alliance and economic community.

But there is one thing to which I would like to draw attention -- something very

important that contains a certain reserve, so to speak, of progressive and useful political forces and progressive political potential. This our countries' cooperation with the developing and liberated countries. Until now they have primarily shown concern for solving their internal problems and making ends meet, so to speak. Recently, however, they have begun to come out onto the world scene very actively, saying widely and in a well-argued way that they, too, have interests and that they also are affected by issues of war and peace -- which is quite right. I think that the development of bilateral relations between the socialist countries and the developing countries will ensure that this untapped political potential for progressive development in strengthening peace and preventing the threat of war will be used more effectively than hitherto.

[Shishlin] In winding up our conversation I would say we have seen throughout 1986 convinces us that the potential for peace really is growing, and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is quite right in his conclusion in his replies to chief editor of RUDE PRAVO that we have entered, or are entering, the second phase of a global antinuclear process when all the ideas are on the table, and the time has come for action. I should like to say good-bye to our viewers and to thank you for taking part of our conversation. Good-bye!

U.S. 'Silence, Spy Mania'

LD132319 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 13 Sep 86

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Yevgeniy Grachev]

[Excerpts] Hello Comrades. The past week in international life has been punctuated by a wide discussion of the major Soviet peace initiatives put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. [passage omitted]

The Soviet Union has made a new important step toward curbing the arms race; it is now up to the United States. But is there any kind of shift in the position of the White House with regard to the major Soviet initiative? How are the replies of the Soviet leader to the questions of the Czechoslovak newspaper RUDE PRAVO being assessed in the United States? Listen to the report of our correspondent in New York, Vladimir Zvyagin.

[Zvyagin] The reaction in the United States to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies to RUDE PRAVO can be presented 2-fold. On the one hand the official propaganda; the national mass media is striving to keep silent about the new appeal from the USSR for a sensible, constructive policy in the sphere of disarmament based on the new realities of the nuclear age. References to Comrade Gorbachev's speech have appeared in the reports of news agencies, in certain major newspapers such as THE WASHINGTON POST or THE NEW YORK TIMES, and in television commentaries. But without doubt, this is not commensurate with the scale and depth of the Soviet proposals. Everyone I have spoken with about this over the past few days admits it.

At the same time a hysterical spy-mania campaign is being stirred up by certain circles in the country. Sometimes one is dumbfounded at how crudely and clumsily U.S. propaganda operated, how primitive the set of stock phrases and tricks used by it is. But the paradox is that these cliches are working in a whole number of cases, and the campaign of lies and juggling with facts orchestrated by whoever's invisible hand it is, is reaping results. The reasons for this extreme annoyance of a whole number of

exceptionally influential figures in the U.S. leadership, including those in the entourage of the President himself, concerning the nature of Soviet foreign policy on the offensive, particularly in recent months. They feel they really ought to respond, but there is as yet nothing to respond with except general discussions about devotion to peace. Hence the accusations of propaganda against the Soviet Union and new objections concerning the monitoring system, work on which they say has not been finished, and so on and so forth.

PRAVDA Weekly Review

PM150929 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Sep 86 First Edition p 4

[Vladimir Peresada "International Review"]

[Excerpt] Yet another week of 1986, the 37th, has passed. It was crammed with the most diverse events in international life. Some of them have flashed into the past, like a moth which lives for only 1 day. By contrast, others are plowing a deep furrow in world politics.

The key disarmament problems raised in M.S. Gorbachev's 18 August statement, and first and foremost the question of the moratorium on nuclear explosions, remain at the center of international debate. This debate received a strong additional impetus from the Soviet leader's interview to the newspaper RUDE PRAVO. It gave answers to not only the Czechoslovak newspaper but essentially all mankind, which is profoundly alarmed that the moratorium introduced and already extended four times by the Soviet Union to this day remains unilateral.

There is still time for the United States to finally join the moratorium, but it is becoming shorter and shorter. The countdown is in progress. And not only the future of relations between the two great powers depends to a great extent on whether the moratorium becomes a joint one in the remaining 15 weeks or, possibly, proves to be the last Soviet decision of this kind. The prospects for the development of the international situation as a whole also depend on it.

A Unique Chance

Th answers to RUDE PRAVO immediately found themselves at the center of world public attention. When you read the reports you can see that irrespective of the differences in the social systems in the countries from which the reactions come and no matter how the people expressing their views may be different and sometimes implacable in their political views, the teletype tapes are dominated by a single thought: The Soviet moratorium provides a unique chance for emerging from the savage nuclear confrontation and easing international tension.

The Soviet arguments have made a great impression in the world. They convincingly rebuff the claims spread in the West that the Soviet Union's latest extension of the moratorium is a propaganda gesture. The total untenability of the United States' "antimoratorium" arguments has been exposed. The USSR is advocating real progress in curbing the arms race, the Japanese newspaper ASAHI notes. The attitude displayed toward nuclear explosions is today the touchstone by which the real thrust of any nuclear state's foreign policy is gauged, France's L'HUMANITE writes. The Soviet leader showed totally plainly who is afraid of the moratorium and why and who is not

interested in banning tests of nuclear weapons, the Polish newspaper TRYBUNA LUDU comments.

These "who's" and "why's" apply wholly to the Washington administration. Increasing numbers of people in the world (and indeed in the United States, too) realize that what lies behind its refusal to join the moratorium is the United States' aspiration to achieve military superiority and continue the arms race by creating [sodravaya] more sophisticated types of weapons and extending this race to new spheres, particularly outer space. [paragraph continues]

Does this not conceal an intention to continue to rely on force in solving international problems, to dictate its own will to sovereign states, and to stifle liberation movements. Another reason the moratorium is evidently unacceptable to the Washington leaders is their fear of honest competition with the other social system in the sphere of the economy, democracy, and culture. The nuclear explosions are continuing because they are not concerned about what happens to nature or the human habitat and because the profits of the manufacturers of death are more important to them than the views and vital interests of hundreds of millions of people.

As is known, Washington has already tried a multitude of tricks to avoid meeting the Soviet moratorium proposal half-way. Conjecture about the impossibility of monitoring [kontrol] the holding of tests, claims that explosions are important not so much for developing nuclear weapons qualitatively as for verifying the combat capability of existing nuclear charges, statements about a threat to U.S. security, and so forth have been put into circulation.

Recently officials in the United States and American propaganda have been gambling on the following thesis: It is not test explosions but nuclear weapons which are terrifying, they say, and therefore it is not a moratorium but the reduction of nuclear arsenals which should be discussed. An attempt is thereby being made to artificially subdivide the problem, counterpose the moratorium to arms reductions, and depict it as unimportant and even as a measure obstructing the disarmament process. Here it is deliberately "forgotten" that back in January the USSR proposed a joint start on "eradicating the evil itself" -- eliminating all nuclear weapons by the end of the century.

And attention has been drawn to this throughout the world. "The Soviet Union's position is that the ending of nuclear explosions is organically linked with reducing nuclear weapons and would make a very substantial contribution to curbing the arms race," the XINHUA agency (PRC) notes. News agencies, statesmen, and the press of many countries are pointing in their comments to the exposure of the United States' attempts to distort our position and "justify" its obstructionism.

The following is also characteristic. Although the reactions differ in spirit or tone and some are characterized by "enforced caution," in the words of Radio France-Inter, in them you can either hear a very forceful demand or detect in one way or another a desire that the United States should follow the Soviet Union's example and stop nuclear explosions and respond positively to the Soviet appeal to reach an agreement on ending nuclear tests.

What was the reaction to the Soviet leader's interview in the United States itself? How were the American people informed of it? For everything that has been said cannot fail to concern Americans both by virtue of the essence of the matter and also because the Soviet leader's words are addressed not least to precisely the United States.

U.S. newspapers and television companies are no longer capable of hushing up news from Moscow or news flashes which go around the world. However many news reports, not to mention commentaries, deliberately filter out the criticism of Washington's obstructionist policy and "drop" those arguments in the answers which discuss the fundamental significance of the moratorium and analyze the danger of the consequences of the nuclear and space arms race being fueled across the ocean. This is not just a sample of the vaunted "objectivity" of the American press, which manifestly operates on instructions from above. [paragraph continues]

It is evidence of the political impotence of the U.S. Administration, which has nothing to defend itself with and can only hide the truth from the people while at the same time serving up something else to distract the public's attention from the main topic of the day.

To this end, first, anti-Soviet propaganda clamors like the "Daniloff affair" are organized and then something else "a bit more subtle" is dreamed up. Aboard the aircraft in which the U.S. President was returning to Washington from vacation his press secretary told the journalists on board, who inquired about how the White House sees the productiveness of a possible summit: "There will be a productive meeting [vstrecha budet produktivnoy] if the Soviet side wants it to be productive."

How is a statement of this kind to be interpreted? As meaning that everything is allegedly ready for a meeting on the American side, that the problem lies in the Soviet position, and thus that there are demands to which Moscow must respond [s Moskvoyi spros], "the ball is in its court." Yet the situation is completely different. Despite all the USSR's efforts, since the Geneva meeting the sides have not moved an inch closer to a agreement on reducing arms.

Our country has put forward a program for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, the banning of chemical weapons, the elimination of medium-range arms in Europe, a radical reduction in the numerical strength of armed forces, and so forth. For more than a year now we have not been carrying out nuclear explosions. But to all this Washington says "no." And how is it acting?

The latest nuclear explosion in Nevada -- the 20th since the Soviet moratorium was announced -- took place 11 September. And according to the American Peace Test antiwar organization the Pentagon also has a further, simply provocative [vyzyvayushchiy] program for conducting explosions. It is planned to carry out another one in September and three in October, and in December it is planned to carry out a nuclear explosion which reportedly "will be exactly the same" as the April "mighty oak" test, which was accompanied by a severe leak of radiation inside the underground test complex in Nevada.

But Washington is not only engaged in sabotaging the moratorium. The SDI program is being expedited, and other steps undermining the ABM Treaty are being taken. The abandonment [vykhod iz] of the SALT II treaty has been announced. Military maneuvers unprecedented since the fifties have been initiated in the vicinity of the Soviet Union -- from the North Sea and the Baltic to the Far East.

So what is the end result? Mankind is in favor of ending nuclear tests and disarmament, and only the U.S. ruling circles are against. One against the whole world! What we are witnessing is an insane addiction to force, dangerous self-intoxication which is fraught with an explosion. Is even a little thought given there to the act that they have a people of their own who (around 80 percent of the

population, according to the polls) would like an end to the nuclear explosions in Nevada, as, incidentally, throughout the world. Of course, the United States has its own interpretation of the concept of "democracy." But if the general human concept of "democracy" means "the people's power," what kind of "democracy" is it when not the slightest attention is paid to the people's opinion.

It is obvious that an acute and intensive struggle for real movement in curbing the arms race lies ahead. [paragraph continues]

We believe that sensible Americans, together with all those in the world to whom peace is precious, will make the maximum possible contribution to this struggle. It is to be hoped that those who are responsible for the fate of America will also finally come round to heeding the realities of the age, to a new political thinking. It will be saddening if this year the U.S. Administration again disregards the really unique chance which the Soviet moratorium provides for taking a step toward eliminating the nuclear threat. The negative consequences of such a course of events for peace on earth would soon make themselves felt.

14 Sep Talk Show

LD150940 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 14 Sep 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program presented by All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator Boris Vasilyevich Andrianov, with Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the ZA RUBEZHOM editorial board, and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, international observer of KOMMUNIST]

[Text] [Nekrasov] I believe that the main subject of our talk today is what the whole world is talking about -- namely, the replies by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary to the questions by Comrade Zdenek Horeni, editor-in-chief of the Czechoslovak Communist newspaper RUDE PRAVO. I believe I should start with the obvious fact that this new and most important USSR foreign policy document is linked in the most direct way with the fundamental propositions contained in the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement on Soviet television on 18 August. As you will recall, that statement not only dealt with the extension of our moratorium, but also gave a new and broad exposition to the principles of the CPSU and the Soviet state's foreign policy activity in the contemporary world conditions. It was a sort of exposition of the fundamental propositions and conclusions of the 27th CPSU Congress with reference to the international conditions in the world at the present time.

These latest replies provide an explanation of many of the propositions in that statement. They provide answers to the questions being asked abroad regarding the 18 August statement, both to the sincere questions, so to speak, which are asked when our position has not been fully understood, and to the mendacious and sometimes blatantly slanderous attacks by militarist propaganda against our foreign policy. Therefore, these replies must, I repeat, be evaluated in close connection with the fundamental propositions of the 18 August statement. At the same time, I also would link them to another event -- the 41st UN General Assembly session which opens the day after tomorrow, on 16 September. Undoubtedly the issues raised in our recent foreign policy acts -- particularly those connected with ending the nuclear arms race, which first of all means in practical terms ending nuclear weapons tests -- will be at the focus of

attention from the first day of the session of the world forum of states which the annual general assembly meeting represents. Also as you know, there will be meetings between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosyevich Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. During the session in New York those meetings, as you will remember, aim at solving the question of whether the new Soviet-U.S. summit will take place. In this connection, the replies to RUDE PRAVO are of great interest to world public opinion and are of very great practical importance as a new and vivid manifestation of reason and good sense in the current extremely complex and dangerous period in international relations. Overall, I believe that stress should be laid, in connection with everything I have said, on a thought Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev expressed in his replies: I believe that we already have entered the second stage of the global antinuclear process, the phase not only of hopes but of realistic plans and specific actions based upon them.

[Andrianov] Vadim Nikolayevich, you mentioned one of the most important features of our foreign policy in recent times: It is not simply a matter of raising the question of the need for a new political thinking, but, I would say, action based on a new political thinking. This action, although unfortunately of a unilateral nature thus far, has the infectious force of example, and this undoubtedly is very important in the conditions that have now taken shape.

As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted, the most valuable thing we still have left is the time to make joint and responsible, albeit compromise, decisions. Time, however, is passing rapidly, and this is why practical action is so necessary now.

[Nekrasov] Yes, time is passing, but the U.S. side's sabotage of fruitful talks unfortunately continues. I do not believe "sabotage" is too strong a word today to describe the U.S. position at the Geneva talks, for we have not moved forward one inch to an arms reduction agreement since last November's, Geneva summit, and this despite all the Soviet Union's efforts, with which we are all familiar. That is why the mutual cessation of nuclear explosions would be so important now. But I believe there is a quite concrete and clear understanding in the world today about this, an understanding that ending tests will essentially halt the race in the most dangerous sphere -- that of creating a real possibility, having halted the arms race in qualitative terms, for dealing with it in quantitative terms. This, the Soviet Union rightly points out, will be much simpler. The overwhelming majority of mankind supports this viewpoint today. This is shown by the message from the leaders of the so-called Delhi Six to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan. The same thing was shown by the Harare appeal adopted by the 18th Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Countries. The same position is held by major and influential political parties in the West, including the social democrats in West Germany and the British Labor Party. It is virtually the overwhelming majority of mankind, including the Americans. Our press, as you will remember, has on numerous occasions quoted the figure that 80 percent of Americans who now vote vote for ending nuclear tests. And who is against? Their opponents can be named, and counted almost on the fingers of one hand: specifically, official Washington circles, officials in London and Bonn closely connected with them, and the pro-NATO press which essentially is funded by the military industrial complex.

The circles I have named, including many bourgeois mass media and reactionary observers and commentators, are continuing to try to confuse world public opinion, putting forward various arguments about alleged obstacles to agreement on a total end to nuclear tests. That is why I see such great importance in the exposure of those false

arguments which was provided in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies. It was a detailed and convincing exposure based on facts, showing and, to use a phrase, developing like a camera film, the whole essence of the speculation and machinations behind the views on the impossibility of other countries joining the moratorium. Naturally, in this connection I would like to mention factors preventing the achievements, or rather the consolidation of trust, such as the new anti-Soviet campaign being whipped up now in the United States over the facts revealed about a U.S. correspondent's espionage in the Soviet Union, the planned entry by U.S. ships into the Sea of Okhotsk following the current maneuvers in the area of the Japanese islands, and so forth. Therefore, I would like to mention this important point in the replies: that particular responsibility for the course of events and, it may be said, for mankind's future, lies with two great powers -- us and the United States. Hence our position, the one clearly stated in the replies: No matter how we are provoked, we will not break off the threads of contact with the U.S. Administration, nor will we slam the door, although certain people in the West, particularly in the White House entourage, would very much like us to. This Soviet position produces a very great impression on world public opinion.

[Andrianov] Vadim Nikolayevich, you have now come to a question which, I believe, will be of interest to our listeners. How would you sum up the impression that this new Soviet foreign policy act has made on the world? What can be said about this to date?

[Nekrasov] Well, first of all, I want to make the reservation that I will talk about the responses from the other camp, as it were, since the position of our camp -- by which I mean the fraternal socialist community -- is perfectly clear. Our allies and friends understand our position well and support it consistently and firmly. For our part, as Comrade Gorbachev has observed, we very much value and scrupulously take into account the opinion of our allies. We value highly their activities in the struggle for new political thinking, as well as their active and equal participation in the common efforts to resolve the problems of peace, security, and disarmament.

[Andrianov] It seems to me that, in this connection, much is revealed by even the fact that, in order to elucidate the position of our party and state, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee preferred the pages of a publication of the fraternal Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the newspaper RUDE PRAVO; that is, a newspaper of one of the states of our community, which is welded together by the indestructible ties of fraternal friendship.

[Nekrasov] Well, if we're talking about the world as a whole, I think one can repeat the words from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies: The attitude toward nuclear explosions is a test of historical maturity. What is more, it is the touchstone that puts to the test the real purposefulness and main substance of the foreign policy of each nuclear state. Well, that can be said of the responses and reaction of world opinion as of today, that is, literally a few days after publication of the replies?

Like our statement of 18 August, these replies have evoked the most widespread response. This is, undoubtedly, to be explained by the scale of the Soviet Union's new peace-loving initiatives, their exceptional topicality and the account that they take of the demands of the historical period, and the frame of mind and aspirations of the broadest strata of the public. I think it can be formulated in this way -- the general reaction in the world: Moscow has made a vital contribution to the cause of restraining the nuclear arms race and halting the military escalation between East and West.

[Volskiy] I think, Vadim Nikolayevich that it is no exaggeration to say that, in general, the Soviet initiatives to strengthen international security and, primarily now, our moratorium — to a considerable extent, it is precisely this that is determining the political atmosphere in the world. It doesn't always happen directly, perhaps, not necessarily instantly, but it is noticeable virtually everywhere, in all capitals, even in Washington, where, as we've been saying today, the administration is having to react somehow to our initiatives or seek excuses for rejecting them. And at times, I would say, it is having to artificially create such excuses, as you were saying about the actions of the Pentagon. Certainly, the Pentagon and military circles have a clear line in this sense: a glimmer of hope of relaxing international tension has only to spring up — and the mechanism for the deliberate exacerbation of tension switches itself on almost automatically.

[Andrianov] That is all true. Indeed, when Vadim Nikolayevich was speaking about Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies, he touched in passing upon a provocation about which I want to speak in great detail. This was, what I should call, the provocative militarist demonstration that Washington has staged this week in the immediate vicinity of the shores of the Soviet Far East. I have in mind the U.S. naval maneuvers that began 4 days ago in the Sea Of Japan. Incidentally, they are some of the largest maneuvers in recent times. They involved a score of warships, including the strike-aircraftcarriers Ranger and Carl Vinson, which the U.S. and Japanese press say are carrying nuclear weapons. Taking part for the first time in these maneuvers is a recently created formation of the U.S. 7th Fleet. It is the Romeo battleship combat group led by the battleship New Jersey. This formation's distinctive feature is that it is armed with a total of 70 Tomahawk missile launchers. These first-strike weapons can be armed with nuclear warheads. On the subject of these naval maneuvers THE WASHINGTON TIMES has said that never before have so many U.S. ships been concentrated in this area. Citing an official Pentagon spokesman, the newspaper noted that during the exercises the U.S. Navy was to demonstrate its ability to blockade the Tsushima and Tsugaru straits — that is, the international passages from the Sea of Japan into the Pacific Ocean. The Japanese newspaper YOMIURI noted that these maneuvers are the first trial of the new U.S. naval strategy, which was recently announced by John Lehman, U.S. secretary for the Navy. He stated that the Pentagon had decided not to limit itself to just the Atlantic theater and now intended in addition to display its muscles in the northern part of the Pacific Ocean. The Japanese press has no doubt as to the provocative nature of this military display, for instance. In particular ASAHI says that during the maneuvers a nuclear strike on the Far East will be simulated. In the course of this game, if it can be so called, the U.S. cruise missile launchers will operate under the cover of aircraft based in Japan and the navy of Washington's ally in the Far East. The U.S. press has reported that from the Sea of Japan, as you, Vadim Nikolayevich, have already said, the U.S. naval squadron will proceed into the Sea of Okhotsk. In this connection how can one not fail to remember what a rumpus Washington propaganda has been kicking up regarding the mythical Soviet threat in Central America? At the same time no Soviet ships are sailing along U.S. shores, but U.S. warships are getting closer and closer to the Soviet Union's seaboard, not only in Europe but also in Asia.

These obvious facts are by no means evidence of peace-loving attitudes on the part of certain circles across the ocean.

[Volskiy] One might recall in this connection, Boris Vasilyevich, that several months ago, precisely around the time of the first U.S. aggression against Libya this spring, two U.S. ships did indeed pass from the Mediterranean into the Black Sea, approaching the immediate vicinity of the Crimean shores.

[Nekrasov] Yes, up to the shores of the Crimea.

[Andrianov] That is quite true. Returning to the questions that were put to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee by RUDE PRAVO's editor in chief, I should like to note that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev touched upon a very broad range of pressing problems. They also included economic problems, though, true, they were mentioned in connection with the plans of certain circles in the West, above all of course in the United States, to continue their course of an unbridled arms race in order to undermine economically the positions of world socialism. Let us say directly that this is no shiningly new venture. How many times already have the imperialist gentlemen attempted to do this! And nothing has come of it for them, and never will! But they have done quite some harm to themselves!

Let us take, for example, the U.S. economy. In 1984 and 1985 it went through its most profound and protracted crisis for a little over 50 years, and since then it has been unable to enter a period of upswing. For almost a year the U.S. economy has been marking time, as it were. Moreover, specialists in the United States itself believe that the U.S. economy is teetering on the brink of a new crisis. After all, the White House has to all intents and purposes placed the economy's civilian sectors on starvation rations, since the main national resources are at the disposal of the military-industrial complex. In this connection the authoritative magazine FOREIGN POLICY has remarked that the priority that is now plainly being given to arms production is leading to a dangerous destabilization of the country's economy and to the undermining of key nonmilitary industries such as metallurgy, the auto industry and heavy engineering.

For example, here are some figures cited by the very well-informed NEW YORK TIMES: Over the past 4 years the eight leading metallurgical companies in the United States have suffered some \$8 billion in losses. More than 300,000 metallurgical workers have been made redundant. U.S. economists are also drawing a joyless picture of other civilian sectors of the economy, which under existing conditions are unable to compete effectively in world markets with their rivals from other countries. The foreign trade deficit is therefore mounting. Specialists estimate that by the end of this year the trade deficit will be \$190 billion; that is to say that last year's record in this field will be surpassed. In the unanimous view of authoritative experts the sorry state of affairs in the U.S. economy leaves no hopes of solving chronic socioeconomic problems in the United States such as unemployment, poverty, malnutrition, and homelessness. Even the bourgeois press has been forced to admit this. After all, there are over 35 million poverty-stricken people in the capitalist world's richest country. Over 3 million Americans do not have a roof over their heads in the most direct sense of the world. Harvard University research has shown that at present 20 million U.S. citizens are regularly undernourished. Even according to official estimates, the country's army of unemployed is keeping firmly at the 8 million mark, although according to trade-union figures there are 6 million more.

Senator William Proxmire has said that the stumbling U.S. economy simply does not have the resources left for growth, and its future, he emphasized, looks truly frightening. This is all the pay-off for the militarist course of the present Washington administration, which is continuing the arms race.

[Volskiy] Here we reach the end of our broadcast. Thank you for your attention. Until we meet again!

Broadcast to North America

LD152333 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 14 Sep 86

["Top Priority" program presented by Vladimir Pozner with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov -- recorded]

[Excerpts] [Pozner] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. This is Vladimir Pozner presenting "Top Priority." With me on the panel, as usual, are Drs Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov. The theme for today I think is obvious. Let's look at the answers that the general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev, gave to the Czech newspaper RUDE PRAVO. I would like to begin with perhaps a somewhat cynical statement, but it's a cynical statement that we've been hearing in the West, which is upon looking at these answers, I repeat, the reaction is: So what else is new! Deja vu, it's all been said. This kind of dismissing it, kind as if it weren't really all that important. I'd like you to begin at least by examining that approach and what those answers really mean.

[Bogdanov] You know, Vladimir, my first impression is that there is a kind of blackout in American mass media about that interview. [passage omitted]

[Bogdanov] My difficulty is what to do with our listeners and how to deal with that interview in that case when American mass media didn't pay attention to that very important thing. Should we tell our listeners over there about what it's all about or we should just comment? [passage indistinct]

[Pozner] Obviously what I would ask you gentlemen to do is to point out the salient features of the interview so as to make it clear why we consider it to be important. Perhaps you would do that, or begin, Dr Plekhanov? [passage omitted: Plekhanov says a most important point was to outline the meaning of the Soviet moratorium in face of continuing U.S. tests, response to Soviet moratorium confirms that the USSR is right; Pozner sums up by referring to the importance of the moratorium and asks what other point can be brought up]

[Bogdanov] The other point of importance to my mind is that the (?policy) of response to that moratorium is just to signal to us how the other side is serious about nuclear disarmament, because, why, they're insisting on moratoria. Not only because the substance of it is very important because it's a most simple, you know, step in bringing all [words indistinct] with disarmament, creating a proper environment, political environment, mutual trust, if you like. In the environment of mutual trust you can go ahead quicker than you are doing now. That is what moratorium is meant, number two.

Then, you know, I would like to call the attention of our listeners to one very important point of that interview, to rather a question that the secretary general put in his interview, the secretary general of the Communist Party. He put it very bluntly, and very, you know, frankly. What it's all about, why USA does not reciprocate us in that very important (?problem). Are they preparing for nuclear war? If it is so, (?then it's), the behavior of this administration is very logical. They're just getting ready for a new war, they're modernizing their nuclear weapons, they're building new and new warheads more accurate and with the bigger (?toll weight). Then their policy is quite clear and we need an answer to that.

Then I would like to call our listeners' attention to another very important point. That interview is made before meeting, before a meeting between two foreign ministers which is to take place on the 18th and 19th of September, and the importance of this meeting is that discussion at that meeting should signal to us if there is any ground, if there is any grounds for the summit meeting that people are talking about very very much, and it is again, you know, formulated very clearly in that interview that we are very much for that meeting. But we still have in mind one or two practical disarmament problems which have to be resolved during that....

[Pozner, interrupting] We'll get back to that in a (?minute). You made a point there that I'd like to enlarge on and perhaps, you could, Dr Plekhanov, and that is that the moratorium would seem to be a testing stone that would define a government's, society's, attitude towards the whole issue of nuclear disarmament or the arms race. Do you think that's so and do you feel that that is point that was made strongly in this interview?

[Plekhanov] That's right. That's exactly the point. Comrade Gorbachev ran down the arguments against the moratorium, arguments in favor of continuing the testing of nuclear weapons, and he went through all the formal objections that were made by the U.S. Government, largely concerned with verification, with the number of tests, with the kinds of weapons that are being tested, with the problem of reliability testing which we have discussed in one of our "Top Priority" shows. And then he, I think, was able to demonstrate very persuasively that all those objections are worth nothing because if there has been any questions they have been removed by the (?acts) of the Soviet Government and the proposals that we have made concerning verification and so on. And so the year that has passed since the Soviet moratorium started has revealed what are the real objections to a moratorium and I think one of the very vivid portions of the Gorbachev interview had to do with this litany of why the moratorium is not necessary. He said if you want military superiority, of course you don't need a moratorium. [passage omitted]

[Pozner] Did you want to say something Dr Bogdanov?

[Bogdanov] Yeh, I just would like to say one thing. You know, it happens so that nowadays moratorium is the focusing point of the policies of two countries. It's a real testing ground for the genuine arms control, genuine desire to get rid of nuclear weapons, and if you read carefully that interview you will see that the secretary general went out of his, you know, to sum up all the American objections, the whole American position, and he gave answers to any one of American objections to the moratorium. I believe they sound very convincing and I wish our American listeners, that they read it....

[Pozner, interrupting] And not only our American listeners but our listeners that we have all over the world.

[Bogdanov] All over the world, that they read it carefully.

[Plekhanov] If they had an opportunity, I'm not sure they have the opportunity.

[Bogdanov] That's why, Sergey, that's why I'm giving that advice to our listeners because, and I started my comment with my worry, you know, that they have no opportunity to read it because it has not been given a proper, you know, place in the Western and American mass media.

[Pozner] When I interrupted you a couple of minutes ago you were talking about what General Secretary Gorbachev had said concerning a possible summit meeting, U.S.-Soviet summit meeting. Now, in the United States you get the impression, at least when you read the U.S. newspapers, that to begin with at Geneva the two leaders absolutely agreed to have a summit in 1986, regardless of anything. That's the impression you get, and number two that of course there will be a summit, it's a foregone conclusion that there will be a summit. And in fact we know that President Reagan has on several occasion spoken about internal pressures in the Soviet Union that are going to push and force the general secretary to go for this summit, and so on. I think that in connection with that what he said in this interview makes it quite clear just what the Soviet position is on a summit, and I would appreciate it if either of you would elucidate a little bit on that subject for our listeners.

[Plekhanov] There are several points there. Number 1, yes the Soviet Union is preparing for the summit and we consider a summit to be important and we think that a summit can become a major event in Soviet-American relations. But it can be such an event and can serve a good purpose providing there is progress on at least one or two major substantive points concerning the problem of the arms race. This is what the summit is for. Not in order to, you know, to get together and let Comrade Gorbachev see the beauties of Washington D.C. or some other place. So that is an important point because there is a danger with all the proclivities of the American media and the American politicians for window dressing, for really making a big fuss over nothing and creating false impressions, creating illusions. There is a danger that if there is a summit without substance, that those people who are not really interested in stopping the arms race, but want simply a lot of window dressing to put people to sleep, that those people'll be able to say well don't you see everything is going fine.

[Bogdanov] Yeh, and you know there is one point which confirms very much what you have said just now. Just let's have a look at what has happened after the Geneva Summit meeting.

[Plekhanov] Exactly.

[Bogdanov] We, all of us, we have expected that will bring us to very nearby arms control, real arms control solutions. But between Geneva and now we have no progress at all in those controls. I would say even that things became worse than they were at the time of the summit meeting. So we have an impression that all that period was used by the American side as a cover up for the arms race. Now, we have all the right to suspect that if the summit meeting will go the way they want it to go, that will be another cover, maybe more serious for the arms race and for American breakthrough to the outer space, you know. Now what worries me and really makes me very unhappy, that's the distortion of the truth, you know, if you, distortion of the spirit of Geneva, distortion of the situation. For instance, we have a number of meetings of different groups of Soviet and American experts. The other side, the American Administration, creates an impression that's all about summit meeting. Nothing [word indistinct]. It's just to prepare the meeting of two foreign ministers, which has nothing to do with the summit; for two foreign ministers have to find out whether there is a ground for the summit. Now my suspicion is, and growing suspicion, that the other side is creating, you know, a proper environment to blame the Soviet side, that just because of their policy the summit meeting didn't take place and if you know, you know, the people sitting at the places in Washington you may say that my suspicion is not groundless suspicion.

[Plekhanov] You know, one of those people, Kenneth Adelman, a few years ago made an immortal statement which I think quite often comes to mind when one thinks about these issues. He said the arms talks are a sham we have to practice in order to keep the

American people and the allies happy. He made that statement and he's never backtracked from it, and I think that says a lot about the attitude of the Reagan administration.

[Pozner] Well, thank you both very much. Hopefully now our listeners know a little bit more about what is really a very important interview and which sadly has not been made visible to the readership in the United States and in many other Western countries.

Gorbachev Answers Circulated at UN

LD171748 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 17 Sep 86

[Text] New York September 17 TASS -- The text of the answers of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to questions of the RUDE PRAVO editor-in-chief Zdenek Horeni has been circulated at the United Nations as an official document of the U.N. General Assembly and the Security Council.

The attitude to termination of nuclear tests, the early elaboration of the treaty to ban these tests have most convincingly shown today how serious is each of the big nuclear powers in its attitude to disarmament, international security and the cause of peace, the document says.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1580

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: REPORTS, COMMENTS ON U.S. 11 SEPTEMBER TEST

TASS Report

LD120315 Moscow TASS in English 2048 GMT 11 Sep 86

[Text] Washington September 11 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports.

A spokesman for the U.S. Energy Department in the Nevada test range said that on Thursday the United States conducted a new nuclear test codenamed "Aleman". In his words it was linked with the development of nuclear weapons. The nuclear device was exploded in an underground silo at a depth of nearly 500 metres at a distance of roughly 120 kilometres from Las Vegas. As the spokesman for the Energy Department said the yield of the blast was less than 20 kilotons.

He said that the latest nuclear test in Nevada had been the ninth officially announced blast this year. A total of 655 officially announced nuclear tests have been conducted by the USA since 1951.

The latest blast is already the sixteenth test to have been announced by Washington since the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts. Considering the tests, which have not been announced at all, the United States has conducted over that period a total of 20 nuclear blasts. The public organisation American Peace Test says that the United States intends to continue nuclear testing. Thus, in particular, on September 26 a nuclear blast codenamed Labquark is to be conducted. Another three nuclear tests have been scheduled for October.

The main cause why these tests are conducted is to carry on the programme for developing new types of nuclear weapons to replenish the existing arsenal, noted Robert Norris and Thomas Cochran, officials of the U.S. Natural Resources Defence Council, in an article published in the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST. The U.S. military laboratories, scientists say, are at present engaged in work to create nuclear pumped weapons for the star wars programme and other aims. They claim that from 500 to 1,000 nuclear tests will be necessary for their development effort. According to the authors, the imposition of a mutual moratorium on nuclear blasts, which is now unilaterally observed by the Soviet Union, will gradually slow down, and in the final analysis, halt the process of the creation of these weapons, a development which the Pentagon fears.

Scientists from the Natural Resources Defence Council, who are participating in the joint Soviet-American experiments, say that at present there are technical facilities for the verification of observance of the ban on nuclear testing. It takes only political will to introduce such a moratorium.

TASS Commentary

LD122128 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 12 Sep 86

[Commentary by TASS Political Commentator Yuriy Kornilov]

[Text] A report from Washington: As a representative of the department of energy of the United States of America stated to a TASS correspondent, the 20th underground nuclear explosion since the introduction of the Soviet moratorium, carried out at the testing ground in Nevada on the 11 September, code-named Aleman, was connected with the development of nuclear weapons.

At the microphone is TASS Political Observer Yuriy Kornilov:

[Kornilov] Stubbornly refusing to respond to the USSR's call to ban all nuclear explosions, U.S. ruling circles, as is known, are trying to give their militarist line a kind of propagandist guarantee -- and what cock-and-bull stories don't they put out in order to belittle the significance of the Soviet moratorium and to justify their own negative position! Here and throughout, there are false arguments to the effect, as they say, that neither a unilateral moratorium, nor even a bilateral agreement with the United States on this question supposedly will give anything to resolving the problem of nuclear disarmament. There are also fabrications about the USSR supposedly having outstripped the United States, although it is known that the United States has carried out 1 and 1/2 times more nuclear explosions, and in the past 5 to 10 years, it has systematically left our country behind in the quantity of such explosions by almost one-third. Speculations have been built on sand to the effect that supposedly a ban on nuclear tests is impossible to monitor [prokontrolirovat] although scientists in various countries, including in the United States, are unanimous that there are means for monitoring [kontrol] and that they are most reliable. In reality it goes without saying, the fact that Washington -- not taking into account the opinion of the world public, including that of the United States -- is continuing nuclear tests at testing grounds in Nevada, this fact is connected not with the mythical lagging behind on the part of the United States and not with the mythical problems of monitoring. It is connected with the striving of certain circles in the United States, acting to please the military-industrial complex, the weapons kings, to continue the arms race at any cost, and with their attempts to transfer such a race into spheres. It is this fact that once more corroborates the revelation of the representative of the U.S. energy department.

The press and authoritative experts have often reported that nuclear tests, which THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper with good reason describes as the key to setting fire to the entire arms race, aim to create new types of weapons and that they are being carried out within the framework of work to create space weapons. This in essence was admitted in the statement by the representative of the department of energy. Thus, it has once again been confirmed that the aim of nuclear explosions at testing grounds in Nevada is the creation of new and more perfected types of weapons; and it is an illusory calculation by those in power in Washington that, as they say, by hook or by crook, they will succeed in (?destroying) the balance of forces that has been establishing and in ensuring military superiority for the United States. It is this very political line which has led to the fact that despite all the USSR's efforts, the sides, since the Geneva meeting, have not come even an inch closer to an agreement on reducing weapons. It is a dangerous, very dangerous course.

Monitoring Issue Dismissed

LD122321 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 12 Sep 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vladimir Tsvetov]

[Text] Hello, comrades. You already know from radio and press reports that an underground nuclear explosion has been carried out at the test site in the State of Nevada -- the 20th since the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests.

To the accompaniment of the Nevada blasts, official Washington continues to shy away from the Soviet proposal for a mutual ban on all nuclear explosions.

In order that it should do nothing for such a ban, the U.S. Administration -- as is obvious from statements by its representatives -- is not adverse to working pretty hard to think up more and more arguments against a moratorium. One of them is: the impossibility of monitoring nuclear tests. The United States puts this argument forward everytime there is any possibility of getting the process of limiting the race of nuclear and other arms moving again. The same has happened this time. However, that argument no longer works. In the first place, national verification devices have become so reliable that even the smallest explosion can be pin-pointed. Thus, all the U.S. underground nuclear explosions carried out in 1985 and 1986 and not declared by the United States have been detected in the Soviet Union. Naturally, the Americans also have similar equipment. The effectiveness of these devices is confirmed by the Washington administration itself which does not cast doubt on the fact that the Soviet Union is observing its unilateral moratorium.

Soviet and American scientists agreed to install seismographs near the nuclear test sites of the USSR and the United States. When the American experts checked their instruments in Kazakhstan, their leader said: We have achieved great successes in the field of developing high-frequency seismological equipment, and now have a better chance than ever before of agreeing on a total nuclear test ban.

"The Delhi Six" offered their services in organizing monitoring, and the Soviet Union has accepted that offer. If it becomes necessary to set up an international and national network to monitor the cessation of tests, the Soviet Union is willing to do so. So, what are we waiting for? What is lacking is the main thing: A desire on the part of the Reagan administration to stop nuclear explosions. Why? Well, listen to what Robert Norris and Thomas Cochrane of the Natural Resources Council of America, wrote in yesterday's WASHINGTON POST: American military laboratories are working on atomically-charged weapons for the star wars program; in order to develop them, between 500 and 1,000 new nuclear tests will be needed.

In the folklore of the American soldier there is an expression: He's dead, but he won't lie down. At the Nevada test site, the Washington administration has itself killed all its reasons and arguments against a moratorium, yet it is still trying to invent new ones. It is trying because otherwise the possible answer to the question: Is America preparing to fight a war? is yes. But to admit that would be to place oneself beyond the pale of human society and human society has a sense of self-preservation that prompts an even deeper awareness of the reality of the nuclear threat.

'Absurd Logic'

LD122223 Moscow TASS in English 2136 GMT 12 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 12 TASS -- Follows commentary by Vladimir Bogachev, a TASS military writer:

The current U.S. Administration's record of nuclear tests gives a clear idea of the real worth of speeches by official spokesmen for Washington about their wish to make the nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

The twenty nuclear blasts in the U.S. test range in Nevada after the Soviet Union introduced unilaterally its moratorium on August 6, 1986, clearly brings to light Washington's attitude to the very idea of limiting and reducing nuclear weapons.

Putting an end to nuclear tests cannot do damage either to the security of the United States, which, for that matter, has conducted more nuclear blasts than all other countries of the world combined, nor to the security of other states. A ban on blasts would be a measure easy to implement and verify, while being exceptionally effective as regards curbing the arms race and lessening the danger of a catastrophic war.

It is precisely due to the ease of implementation and effectiveness of a ban on nuclear blasts that the problem of tests is rightly considered to be a litmus-paper, which makes it possible to determine quite accurately the real attitude of some or other government to the whole package of the questions of war and peace.

Who will believe that the administration, which refuses even to discuss the question on an end to nuclear blasts, or for a start, on joining in the moratorium on tests, really wishes to eliminate the nuclear weapons?

While refusing to follow the good example of the USSR, which has for more than 400 days now unilaterally abided by the moratorium, the current U.S. Administration has demonstrated that it does not give serious thought to eliminating the nuclear threat to mankind. The Washington leaders, after the USSR has put an end to all nuclear tests, have blown 20 nuclear devices in Nevada and failed in the test of political maturity in front of the whole mankind.

The current U.S. Administration is trying to assure world public that the continuation of nuclear tests in the Nevada test range contributes to strengthening peace and stability on our planet, while the Soviet moratorium, as they claim, hampers progress at the disarmament talks. Following this absurd logic one can draw the conclusion that the safest place for human beings is the crater of a flaming volcano, while the best method to prevent a fire is to pack one's home with gasoline and gun powder.

Continuing nuclear tests means wasting one's energies and funds on aims which are in conflict with the vital interests of the whole of mankind, while the need to turn these energies and funds to good humane matters has incredibly grown.

The world has entered a period of responsible decisions. The Soviet Union wishes to strengthen by its actions hope in the peoples that it is possible to change the present-day dangerous international developments and prove that there is a realistic alternative to the military confrontation.

Instead of wasting the next 10-15 years in the creation of new systems of mass destruction weapons it is necessary to take up reducing the nuclear arsenals and in the long run achieve their total scrapping.

An agreement on ending nuclear blasts could be the first important step on the way towards resolving that truly history-making task.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1580

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: U.S. DELAYS VISAS FOR N-TEST MONITORING MEETING

LD161921 Moscow TASS in English 1853 GMT 16 Sep 86

[Text] New York September 16 TASS — By TASS Correspondent Maksim Knyazkov. A group of prominent Soviet scientists could not arrive in the United States in time to attend a conference on the problems of ending nuclear tests and install seismological equipment for monitoring nuclear explosions and the reason was an obviously deliberate "delay" in granting them U.S. entry visas, Jacob Sherr, a spokesman for a U.S. mass organization called the national resources defense council, said in Denver, Colorado.

Four representatives of the Soviet Academy of Sciences planned to arrive in Denver Sunday so that to start work at the conference, sponsored by Colorado State University, from Monday. The Soviet scientists were to exchange experience there with American colleagues in monitoring nuclear tests. After the forum they planned to go to Nevada to install seismological pickups in the area of the U.S. nuclear testing range.

All these activities were to be conducted under an agreement signed by the U.S. National Resources Defense Council with the Soviet Academy of Sciences earlier this year. It is in keeping with that agreement that American scientists have set up seismological instruments near Semipalatinsk to monitor activities at the Soviet nuclear testing range. That monitoring station has been in service for several months now, manned by rotating groups of American scientists.

The Soviet Union has thereby visually demonstrated its readiness to ensure the strictest verification of its compliance with a Soviet-U.S. nuclear test ban agreement, if it is signed. The State Department's "delay" in granting visas to the Soviet scientists, which has in effect jeopardized the plan to install seismological equipment, has demonstrated clearly, by contrast, that Washington's claims of "readiness for on-site inspections" are bluff meant to mislead world opinion.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1580

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S VORONTSOV ON TEST BAN, SUMMIT CHANCES

PM110813 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 35, 8 Sep 86 pp 4-5

[Article by Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, under the general headline "The Historic Chance Must Not Be Missed": "A Diplomat's View. Halt the Nuclear Malaise"]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev's announcement that the Soviet Union is to extend its unilateral nuclear test moratorium is at the centre of international attention. The overwhelming majority of governments, politicians and public figures the world over are categorically advocating the immediate cessation of nuclear explosions. Only a stubborn influential minority in the U.S. want nuclear explosions to continue to shake the earth.

Washington is now very nervous. Contradictory arguments are being put forward concerning America's continued nuclear testing. White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan says that the U.S. would not be averse to a treaty for a complete, comprehensive nuclear weapon test ban, but it cannot accept such a treaty without a reliable control system. Other spokesmen for the U.S. President discard the control excuse altogether and bluntly assert that the U.S. needs the tests to develop more sophisticated nuclear weapons. Washington is likewise confused as to who is ahead of whom in nuclear armaments. Effectively, the U.S. can offer no plausible explanation for its refusal to join the Soviet moratorium; one is forced to conclude that it needs nuclear explosions simply to carry on with the nuclear arms race in its attempt to obtain military superiority. Naturally, the matter is not at all one of control.

For the Soviet Union control is no problem. This is graphically illustrated by the joint experiment staged by U.S. and Soviet scientists in the Semipalatinsk area in the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Government favoured the agreement to conduct this experiment and said it was prepared to contribute to this implementation. So far Washington has not expressed readiness for a parallel experiment in the U.S.A.

It is now obvious that Washington is motivated not by concern for control, but by efforts to cover up the continued development of new nuclear weapons, specifically to use the energy of nuclear explosions to implement the "star wars" programme.

The Soviet Union greatly appreciates the joint action taken by the heads of state and government of the Group of Six -- Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania, to secure the earliest cessation of nuclear explosions. For our part we have already said that we are prepared to accept their offer to help verify a nuclear test ban, including on site inspection with the proviso, of course, that this is accepted by the U.S. We also view favorably the proposal to arrange a meeting between experts from

these countries and their Soviet and U.S. counterparts, and this was stated by Mikhail Gorbachev in his reply to the heads of state and government of the six countries published on August 24.

We have no objection to talks being resumed with the participation of Britain. We have had such tripartite (the U.S.S.R., the U.S. and Britain) talks in the past, but they broke down through no fault of ours. We would welcome any moves from France in this field. Yet today it is the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. that should come up with concrete proposals for a test ban. However, we would welcome other countries subsequently joining both the moratorium and an agreement should it be concluded.

Today there is every grounds for definitively checking the nuclear malaise on earth through a Soviet-U.S. moratorium and a subsequent relevant agreement. After all, the moratorium should not be viewed as a step to end nuclear tests alone, but within the context of the overall problem of ridding humanity of nuclear weapons, as a prologue to full nuclear disarmament. The stopping of nuclear explosions might be one of the threads by which we could begin to unwind the entire tangle of the problem of nuclear disarmament. If there are no explosions, no new nuclear weapons will be devised, and serious limitations will be imposed on weapons that already exist. This would apply equally to the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

The West is suggesting an intermediate agreement envisaging a gradual reduction in the number of nuclear explosions. Proposals of this order are prompted by the desire to keep open a loophole for the arms race. Indeed, one might ask, why continue nuclear testing in a restricted form when such testing can be ended generally and immediately? The conditions for this exist. The U.S.S.R. is prepared to end tests completely and the Group of Six is advocating this.

It is to be hoped that eventually common sense will gain the upper hand in Washington and the historic chance of ending the arms race will not be missed. We repeat once again that an agreement with the U.S. to end nuclear testing, with fully reliable verification including on-site inspection, is conceivable, and that it can be achieved in a short space of time. An agreement to this effect could be signed at the U.S.S.R.-U.S. summit, which in turn may well materialize if its productivity is ensured and the appropriate political atmosphere generated. Meanwhile, there is no agreement on a firm date for a new Gorbachev-Reagan meeting, contrary to statements that have appeared in some Western mass media.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1580

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

IZVESTIYA'S BOVIN GIVES REASSURANCE ON MORATORIUM

PM111005 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 35, 8 Sep 86 pp 4-5

[IZVESTIYA political observer Aleksandr Bovin article under the rubric "Taking Up a Point" -- first six paragraphs are readers' letters]

[Text] To each new piece of sabre-rattling against you, to each new escalation of the arms race, you reply with new proposals to negotiate, with new peace bids.

While you take pride in your highly moral stand, certain quarters continue to prepare for war against you. It is naive to think that these irreconcilable, brutal moneygrubbers will heed such "abstract" notions as morality, honour, commitment to pledges, etc. I think Soviet patience will not yield the desired results in this case. Rather will it lull popular vigilance and ease the West's way to war.

G.S., British Columbia, Canada

It seems to me as if the U.S.S.R. is always backing down while the U.S., imperialism, generally, is toughening its demands. You have taken initiatives enough. Unless the U.S. stops nuclear testing, there should be no extension of the moratorium. Not one more step back. Otherwise we may see a disaster far worse than that of 1941.

Vaclav Koci, Pardubice, Czechoslovakia

I wholeheartedly support Mikhail Gorbachev's statement. I too raise my voice for peace on Earth, an end to nuclear testing, and a complete ban on atomic weapons. Yet I am anxious. Won't the Americans think that we are demobilizing, that in time we shall be less strong, in the sense that we will lag behind present-day levels of armaments!

L. Kovalenko, Donetsk Region, USSR

Aleksandr Bovin, IZVESTIYA news analyst, replies:

I understand what motivates these letters to NEW TIMES, their concern, and their anxiety. Yet, I am sure that the Soviet political leaders who decided to extend the moratorium were aware of this concern and realized what motivated this anxiety.

Let us analyze the Gorbachev statement once again and attempt to assess the situation together.

Let me begin by noting that as a rule responsible political decisions are not easily taken. This is certainly the case with regard to the decision taken by the CPSU Central Committee Political Bureau and Soviet Government to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. Mikhail Gorbachev said this was not a simple move, but an extraordinarily responsible and difficult one. Indeed, to adopt the right decision, it was essential to give the fullest consideration to every aspect of the problem, and compare political with military-technological factors.

We have now had no tests for over a year. Conventional logic suggests that if tests are needed to strengthen security, a unilateral refusal to conduct such tests could adversely affect national security and place the U.S. at a strategic advantage.

There is good reason to think so. But in the first place we, like the Americans, have substantial reserves of strength, which means that it would be hard to gain, or lose, any essential strategic advantage. Maintaining military-strategic parity is the best antidote to any ventures in this situation. In the second place, there is a time limit to unilateral action. If Washington continues with its stubborn "No," if it continues to detonate nuclear devices, we shall be forced to resume testing.

Yet the main thing, as I see it, is that in this nuclear age security built on arms escalation becomes increasingly dangerous.

You must agree that the more weapons we have, the more mistrust there will be, and the more there is of that the greater the likelihood will be of these weapons being used. Only political accord, a reciprocal agreement to cut back and subsequently completely abolish nuclear weapons can give us genuine security.

Our approach to nuclear explosions, along with other concrete proposals and concrete actions, is geared to the attainment of this fundamental objective.

All analogies are tentative and conventional. However, let us seek a parallel with the game of chess currently popular the world over. To gain in quality the player may sacrifice quantity. The same may be said of the moratorium. For the time being its political advantages outweigh the disadvantages in the sphere of military technology.

I mean that by extending the moratorium we are strengthening the Soviet Union's political position, and our country's prestige. We are stepping up the pressure against the Americans, curtailing their freedom of action, and proving their helpless, invented arguments invalid. We are also giving an additional incentive to the anti-war and anti-nuclear movement, and are strengthening the position of the non-aligned countries.

The Soviet Union is saying again and again that we should take a new approach to the entire range of issues related to security, and proceed from a balance based on fear to one based on trust, a balance of interests, as only this approach accords with the realities of our nuclear age.

I fully admit that we may not reach agreement with the present U.S. Administration. However, the history of the country does not end with Reagan's presidency. Our action has the long term in mind.

Now about 1941. I think the comparison of this nature is wrong. It fails to recognize the fundamental changes of quality since then in the sphere of military strategy. Today no potential aggressor can hope to win. He who shoots first dies second. That

is how the matter stands and the Americans realize this. In this context the surprise factor also appears in a different light. Today nobody will be caught napping. Retaliation is inevitable.

Such is the picture.

So there is no need for anxiety. We know we were dealing with. We have no illusions. We are strong enough not to accept the "rules of the game" that they want us to play. T brawn we oppose brawn plus brain. To adventurist hankerings we oppose a sense of responsibility, fortitude and conviction, the conviction that humanity will be able to surmount the crisis phase, avoid the catastrophe, and create a world without wars and without arms.

Is this utopian? The goal of history is, after all, to make utopia a reality.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1580

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET ARMY PAPER DISCUSSES VERIFICATION

PML31407 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Aug 86 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Captain 2d Rank Ye. Nikitin: "Hackneyed Arguments"]

[Text] Since mankind became aware of its existence, there have been a considerable number of strained, difficult, and crucial periods in its development. It has been threatened by starvation and terrible epidemics, natural disasters and devastating wars taking hundreds of thousands and even millions of lives. But never have people been faced with such an ominous danger of universal annihilation. The mythical "Sword of Damocles" has assumed quite concrete forms: Tens of thousands of nuclear munitions. And this sword is hanging over our planet.

This danger has been particularly clearly highlighted by two tragedies connected with the technology of the nuclear-space age: The deaths of the "Challenger" crew and the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant. They served as a cruel reminder that people are still in the process of familiarizing themselves with the fantastic, powerful forces which they themselves created and are still only learning to place at the service of progress. These events served as an object lesson of what would happen if nuclear weapons were used.

Under these conditions the chief and only path to security is the total elimination of these terrible mass destruction weapons. And the most effective means of resolving this problem is to stop all nuclear explosions. Sober-minded specialists, scientists, politicians, and members of the military are of like mind with regard to the fact that ending nuclear tests really securely closes the channels for improving nuclear weapons. And this task is paramount. Resolving it would place a barrier in the way of creating even more sophisticated, lethal types of nuclear weapons. This is also clear to the nonspecialist. Even the American WASHINGTON POST, assessing the importance of the Soviet Union's extension of the nuclear test moratorium it introduced more than a year ago, was forced to admit that "tests are the ignition key to the entire arms race: It is enough to turn this key--and the motor will die."

A moratorium on nuclear explosions would be the first practical step on the way to a general improvement in the international situation. The

juggernaut [sostav] loaded to the top with nuclear weapons is gathering speed with every passing day. Prudence tells us that it must be stopped before it is too late. This fact is elementary and clear to all.

One must suppose that Washington also well understands this. Understands, but is in no way able to renounce its pernicious aspirations to gain military superiority over the Soviet Union. Even in the 1980 Republican Party platform there is a clause which states directly that the United States must aspire to superiority. This mirage continues to obscure Washington strategists' real perception of the world even today. But the joint Soviet-American statement signed in Geneva clearly states that the sides "will not aspire to superiority."

The Soviet Union strictly adheres to the accords reached and does not seek unilateral advantages and benefits for itself. Our country took the difficult decision to introduce a moratorium on all nuclear explosions and has repeatedly extended it.

This cannot be said of the United States, however. It continues to follow its militarist course, refuses to join the Soviet moratorium, and thinks up various pretexts and hackneyed arguments in its justification.

One of the most weighty "arguments" in favor of its obstructionist policy of many years up until the present day has been the completely far-fetched, totally unfounded problem of verification [kontrol]. "We are not against a treaty on a complete and general ban on nuclear weapon tests, but we are against the conclusion of such a treaty without an appropriate system of verification. "[Proverka]," White House Chief of Staff Regan said recently. "We want to be able to check what they are doing and we think they would also like to know what we are doing."

Well, this seems to be totally logical. What is holding things up, one asks? After all, these issues were the subject of detailed discussion 6 years ago within the framework of tripartite negotiations involving the Soviet Union, the United States, and Great Britain. The Soviet Union developed and proposed a clear-cut verification [kontrol] system. It included the use of both national technical means and international measures for this purpose. In addition to the consultations and exchange of information generally accepted in agreements and treaties, the international measures primarily envisaged the exchange of seismic data, which is the most effective instrument in recording a nuclear explosion.

The Soviet Union envisages on-site inspection [proverka] as an important integral part of verification [kontrol]. And consent to the installation of American monitoring apparatus in the Semipalatinsk region is clear evidence of this. Our country is also prepared to make use of the proposal by the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, and Tanzania, who have offered assistance in verifying [proverka] an end to nuclear tests. What is more, the Soviet Union is willing to reach agreement on additional verification [kontrol] measures.

In short, the USSR's position on the verification [kontrol] problem is quite clear. And its readiness to enter into the broadest forms, into any forms of verification [kontrol]--both national and international, even including on-site inspection--has knocked the ground once and for all from under the feet of the rulers of present-day America. The verification [kontrol] argument immediately "lost its luster," as American political observers themselves note. And Washington's position, in the words of THE WASHINGTON POST, presents an unseemly sight, "when the administration is dragged kicking to talks on a treaty on a general ban on nuclear weapon tests."

Driven into a corner by the Soviet Union's peace initiatives which are indestructible in terms of their logic, the present leaders of the American Administration try to substantiate their refusal to join the moratorium with far-fetched references to the need to safeguard the "security of the United States and its friends and allies." In this connection they talk about the fact that nuclear tests are necessary to the United States "for maintaining its deterrent forces at the proper level" because, so they say, reliance on strategic nuclear forces is still the basis of American policy.

In actual fact, there is not a grain of truth in this claim either. The nuclear tests conducted today have no bearing on deterrence. They are certainly not the result of any need to verify [proveryat] the reliability of existing arsenals. This is said both by Soviet and by Western military and technical specialists. Even the American press admits that of all the nuclear explosions conducted by Washington today only 5 percent of the tests have this purpose. Nuclear weapons already long tested have been stockpiled to such a degree that if they were to be reduced not merely twice over, but three, four, five times over, there would still be enough left for deterrence.

The picture would seem to be quite clear and not requiring further elucidation. And obviously it is precisely for this reason that certain Western mass information media are attempting to present black as white and vice versa. They are striving to instill the idea in public opinion that the Soviet initiative is supposedly "propaganda." This is truly absurd. Really, how can one talk of propaganda if our country has not only declared a moratorium but is putting its words into practice? And how sarcastically T. Downey, member of the U.S. Congress House of Representatives, observed when commenting on the appeal by the "Delhi Six" in favor of the speediest end to nuclear explosions, "the U.S. Administration can in no way call this step by the six states a propaganda conspiracy with Moscow."

The real reason for the United States' obstructionist position both on the issue of ending nuclear tests and on other problems of vital importance to mankind is primarily that the political thinking of the U.S. leaders lags dangerously behind the realities of the present day and the profound changes that have taken place in international life and in the world in general. It has in fact closed ranks with the thinking of the owners of

the "production lines of death" manufacturing sophisticated destruction weapons capable of destroying civilization on earth.

The military business, as it well known, is very rapacious and merciless. Yesterday it needed millions, today billions, tomorrow trillions. But it is not only the thirst for profit that whips up the arms race. The interests of the bosses of the military-industrial complex are at one with the ambitious interests of the ruling elite. And they count on achieving several goals: Not to allow any drop in the profits on arms production; to secure military superiority for the United States; to try to exhaust the Soviet Union economically and ultimately secure command positions in the world, fulfill long-standing imperial ambitions, and continue to pursue a policy of robbery in relation to the developing countries.

A cursory glance at the U.S. nuclear rearmament program is enough to understand where the militarist course of the American rulers is leading. The United States intends to deploy 100 MX intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMS). It is planned to equip each missile with 10 nuclear warheads each with a yield of 600 kilotons. This means that 1,000 warheads will be added to the present arsenal, each of these warheads being 30 times more powerful than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

It is also planned to deploy 1,000 "Midgetman" missiles which will be taken into service at the beginning of the nineties. This is another 1,000 nuclear warheads.

The D-5 missile is being expeditiously created for "Trident" nuclear missile submarines. The Pentagon intends to purchase 744 missiles, each of which will be equipped with 7-14 warheads. This will be an additional 5-10,000 nuclear warheads.

B-1B and ATB heavy bombers for the U.S. strategic airforce are being created and deployed, and there are plans to use them as delivery vehicles for the new generation of nuclear weapons. This will be another several thousand nuclear munitions.

Finally, thousands of new cruise missiles of both present and future generations are to be added. There will be more than 8,000 of these.

It is not difficult to calculate that in the event of a U.S. refusal to join the Soviet moratorium the already excessive number of nuclear munitions will be swelled by tens of thousands of new nuclear charges. And this is only in the strategic range. But we must also take account of the fact that Washington is implementing a large-scale program in the sphere of operational-tactical and tactical nuclear weapons.

The White House position regarding the Soviet nuclear test moratorium is therefore rooted precisely in the unrestrained nuclear arms race and the almost total militarization of the country.

The military people who are particularly responsible for our state's defense capability are closely following the actions of the U.S. administration in the sphere of the development of its military and technical potential. And those across the ocean should not entertain illusions that they have a monopoly on scientific and technical progress in military matters. This problem is now being resolved in not one but many directions.

The Soviet Union can visualize the dangers posed by the uncontrolled buildup of nuclear arsenals and by the adventurist program for the U.S. creation of space-based strike weapons. But for every action reliable means of counteraction can be found, and they will not necessarily be what the United States expects. Our own science and industry, the armed defenders of the motherland, and all Soviet people will be able to give a worthy response to American attempts to tip the present military and strategic balance in their favor.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1580

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: SWEDISH CD ENVOY SAYS MONITORING 'ABSOLUTELY RELIABLE'

PM101611 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 4

[V. Kuznetsov report: "Peaceful Challenge"]

[Text] Geneva--M.S. Gorbachev's statement takes into consideration the positions of governments and strata of the world public concerned by the nuclear arms race, R. Ekeus, head of the Swedish delegation at the Disarmament Conference, has stressed.

The Soviet moratorium and its extension for another 6 months is an important contribution to the work of the multilateral forum represented by our conference. Taking this decision was a difficult and crucial point in state life if one considers that another 18 underground nuclear explosions have been carried out at the Nevada testing ground during the Soviet moratorium, three of these explosions going unannounced. The United States continues to improve its nuclear weapons, and so one must have a deep understanding of one's responsibility for the fate of peace to take a risk for the sake of resolving a cardinal task--the task of ending nuclear tests. The Soviet Union has thrown down a challenge, but it is a peaceful challenge, and we urge other countries to follow this decision.

I agree that the only way to overcome confrontational deadlocks is through the study and consideration of others' viewpoints and through dialogues and contacts, discussions and talks. Yes, it is essential to melt the ice of mutual distrust, and the Disarmament Conference presents a fine opportunity for this. Taking the positions of other states into account, the Swedish delegation has submitted a proposal formulated in Document SD/712. As we have indicated in the document, the technical means are now available to detect and identify the smallest underground explosions. The international community has at its disposal effective monitoring devices, and we in Sweden firmly say: It is impossible to conceal any nuclear explosion even if it is carried out in deep underground caverns.

A comprehensive ban on nuclear weapon tests would place a barrier in the way of the arms race but, of course, it would have to be effective, global, and verifiable. It has already been proved (including by the fact that the unannounced explosions in the United States were detected) that today's seismology is absolutely reliable and, in conjunction with on-site

verification and inspection, would form a well-balanced system to verify the proposed agreements on a nuclear test ban. Together with other neutral and nonaligned states, Sweden is in favor of drawing up an agreement on the prevention of an arms race in space, which is included on the conference agenda. Nuclear weapons can and must be outlawed.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1580

6 October 1986

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: PYONGYANG CONFERENCE URGES KOREAN NFZ

Kim Il-song Addresses Conference

LD061954 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 6 Sep 86

[Text] Pyongyang September 6 TASS -- The People's Democratic Republic of Korea actively supports the Soviet Union's peace initiatives aimed at the defence of peace and security all over the world, and expresses solidarity with the Soviet people's struggle for their implementation, said general secretary of the Korean Workers' Party, PDRK President Kim Il-song. He was addressing a meeting in Pyongyang today with the participants in the current international conference for nuclear-free, peaceful Korean peninsula. The proposals of the CPSU and the Soviet Government on a ban on nuclear testing, a cut in nuclear weapons, prevention of militarisation of outer space and total elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons, as well as the extension by it of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts clearly demonstrate the the CPSU, the USSR are pursuing a peaceful foreign policy, [words indistinct] displaying a responsible attitude to questions pertaining to he elimination of the nuclear threat and defence of peace and security on earth, Kim Il-song stressed.

Conference Supports Gorbachev Proposals

LD072158 Moscow TASS in English 2022 GMT 7 Sep 86

[Text] Pyongyang September 7 TASS -- Struggle for the suppression of centres of the war threat in different regions is one of the more important tasks of all the peace forces in the world, the participants in an additional conference for a nuclear-free and peaceful Korean Peninsula, taking place in the capital of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, point out. Their speeches are evidence of te strong impact on the peace efforts of the Soviet Union's program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the current century and the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. These initiatives were appreciated by delegates from Mozambique, the USA, Burundi, Malta and a number of other countries, who called upon all the nuclear powers to follow the Soviet example. Peace campaigners from Japan, Bulgaria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia voiced support for the concept of strengthening peace and security in Asia and the Pacific, put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his speech in Vladivostok. Mirsahib Karwal, an alternate member of the Politbureau and secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, characterized the Soviet Union's decision to return six Soviet regiments from Afghanistan back home as a manifestation of the goodwill of the Soviet Union and Afghanistan and their sincere desire to achieve a political solution of the problems of the regions.

Mikhail Gorbachev presented in his speech in Vladivostok an integral and consistent program of action aimed to ensure that Asia and the Pacific are no longer a source of tension or a scene of war preparations and that this region becomes effectively involved in the overall process of the establishment of a comprehensive system of international security, proposed at the 27th CPSU Congress, Zaura Kadyrova, the leader of the Soviet delegation, who is secretary of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, said in her speech. It is characteristic of the Soviet approach that it relies on the invigorating of the efforts of the Asian countries themselves with a view to the formulation of measures to ensure peace and stability in the region. That is why the Soviet Union thinks highly of the peace policy of the Korean Republic of Korea and their efforts to establish a nuclear-free zone of peace in the Korean peninsula.

PRAVDA Commentary

PM111414 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Sep 86 First Edition p 5

[V. Razuvayev dispatch: "Peace and Tranquillity to the Korean Peninsula"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 9 Sep -- "Transforming the Korean Peninsula into a nuclear-free zone, a zone of peace." This was the theme of an international conference held in Pyongyang 6-8 September. It was attended by more than 120 delegations from 78 countries, including the Soviet Union, and also by representatives of a number of international democratic organizations.

The topicality of the problems discussed at the conference is self-evident and their solution is long overdue. As a result of aggressive U.S. intrigues, Korea has been divided for more than 40 years now and its southern part has been transformed into a military-nuclear bridgehead of the Pentagon. Forty thousand U.S. servicemen are permanently stationed there, and more than 200 military installations are located there, including bases and arms dumps at which many hundred units of nuclear weapons are stored. It was stated at the conference that with the "full agreement" of its rulers several tens of experimental samples of the neutron bomb have been brought to South Korea from across the ocean. A decision to deploy Pershing-2 and cruise missiles on its territory has been adopted recently. Provocative scenarios of "limited nuclear war" are regularly rehearsed near the territory of the DPRK. At the same time, efforts to pull together a Washington-Tokyo-Seoul militarized triangle are being stepped up. All this, the conference participants declared from the rostrum, has exacerbated the situation on the Korean peninsula to a dangerous degree and has transformed it into one of the world's explosive spots.

Understandably, aggressive actions of this kind on the part of the U.S. ruling circle and their Seoul placemen cannot fail to evoke the Koreans' justified concern. Their alarm is shared by the peoples of Asia and all people who treasure peace and security. In the prevailing situation the DPRK Government of favorable conditions for the country's peaceful reunification. Its step in this direction are common knowledge. They include proposals for withdrawing all U.S. forces and nuclear weapons from South Korea, replacing the armistice agreement with a peace agreement, and holding tripartite talks between DPRK, South Korean, and U.S. military leaders on the establishment of a Democratic Confederate Republic of Korea. In the present complex conditions fraught with the threat of a new armed conflict, special importance is attached also to Pyongyang's recent proposal to transform the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone, a zone of peace.

These constructive steps of people's Korea had the support of all the conference participants. They noted in their speeches and in the adopted documents that the package of new soviet initiatives aimed at ending the nuclear arms race, preventing its psread to space, and completely eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons and also extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests by the Soviet Union represent an improtant step in support and development of the peace-loving Asian states' initiatives to strengthen trust and mutual understanding between the countries of the Asia and Pacific region of which the Korean peninsula is component part. These initiatives, Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee and DPRK president, said, addressing the conference participants, graphically demonstrate the responsible stance and peace-loving policy of the CPSU and the Soviet Government to eliminate the threat of nuclear war and to defend peace and security on earth.

The results of the representative international conference which has ended in Pyongyang testify to the growing desire of the peoples of the Asian and other continents to make their contribution to the joint quest for a common comprehensive approach to the formation of security systems and lasting peace on our planet.

Broadcast to China

OW110607 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0700 GMT 10 Sep 86
[Shakov commentary]

[Excerpts] Listeners: We have reported that an international meeting was held in Pyongyang aimed at making the Korean Peninsula a nuclear-free, peace zone. The meeting adopted a declaration calling on the United States to remove its military bases in South Korea and withdraw its forces. It opposed the rigging up of a U.S.-Japan-Korea military alliance. Our station commentator Shakov writes:

These demands show the aspirations of nations in the Asia-Pacific region. Militarization of this region is being accelerated every day owing to the U.S. ruling clique's efforts. The United States vainly seeks military superiority in Asia. It has always had military bases in Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and other Asian countries; it has deployed nuclear weapons on many of these military bases. The United States has deployed more than 1,000 nuclear warheads in South Korea alone. This is why the call for making the Korean Peninsula a nuclear-free zone is particularly urgent.
[passage omitted]

The Soviet Union has steadfastly supported the desire of people of all countries to make their region a nuclear-free zone. The Soviet Union welcomes the establishment of nuclear-free zones. As you all know, the Soviet Union has proposed that all nuclear weapons be destroyed by the end of this century. Since 6 August 1985, the Soviet Union has unilaterally suspended all nuclear tests. Although Washington has provocatively conducted repeated nuclear tests, the Soviet Union has yet again extended its moratorium until New Year's Day 1987. [passage omitted]

It should be pointed out that the Soviet Union's peace proposal has enjoyed widespread support among the people of all countries in the Asia-Pacific region. They also highly praise China's action. During the Soviet nuclear test moratorium, unlike the Western nations, China has not conducted a single nuclear test. The latest situation shows that the Soviet Union and China still have tremendous latent force to cooperate for peace and the socialist cause for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

U.S.-SOVIET TALKS RECESS--Geneva, 18 Sep (TASS)--The second round of Soviet-U.S. talks on the whole range of questions concerning nuclear tests has ended here. Wide-ranging discussions were held and a detailed exchange of views took place. At the same time the presence was confirmed of essential divergences between the sides in their approach to the problem under discussion. Speaking to journalists here, the head of the USSR delegation, A.M. Petroysants, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Use of Atomic Energy, noted with regret that the U.S. side was not manifesting the necessary flexibility and was, as before, adopting the line of continuing tests rather than halting them with the corresponding monitoring. The delegations intend to meet again in Geneva in November this year. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1042 GMT 18 Sep 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1582

RELATED ISSUES

CPSU OFFICIAL ZAGLADIN ON CONTROL, DISARMAMENT

LD121931 Rome International Service in Italian 1730 GMT 12 Sep 86

[Excerpts] While the controversy over the nuclear issue continues to develop, the government has taken the first steps to take part in the national conference on energy by December as was announced last June at the end of the parliamentary debate following the Chernobyl catastrophe. The agenda for the conference was presented today to Prime Minister Craxi by Industry Minister Zanone, who, together with the minister for relations with parliament, is to consult with the floor-leaders in Parliament next week. The nuclear issue was also mentioned at the L'UNITA festival in Milan where Zagladin, an official of the CPSU Central Committee's foreign department spoke. Here is a report by our correspondent, Caterina Antonangeli:

Zagladin presented himself here with the smiling and cordial appearance imposed by the new Gorbachev line, announcing great plans for the future by the Soviets and an initiative of peace and disarmament which is necessary as a first step toward international detente:

[Begin Zagladin recording in Italian] There is a difference. Everybody talks about control: President Reagan and others, high-ranking officials of the United States--but there is a difference. We talk about the control and verification of disarmament. The United States talks about the control of rearmament. We are for disarmament and absolute control on this process.
[end recording]

/8309

CSO: 5200/2767

RELATED ISSUES

BEIJING REVIEW ON SUPERPOWER ARMS RACE

Beijing BEIJING REVIEW in English Vol 29, No 37, 15 Sep 86 pp 14-15

[Article by Zhou Jirong, Huang Tingwei]

[Text] **S**ince the Soviet Union began to pursue a foreign policy of world domination, the rivalry between the two superpowers for global supremacy and the efforts of other countries to oppose their rivalry have come to be the main features of contemporary international relations. The superpowers are engaged in an intensive arms race with the aim of securing strategic nuclear superiority. This presents a great threat to world peace.

Now that both superpowers possess the capacity to annihilate each other several times over, they need to decide the rules of their endless game of military competition in order to move towards mutual strategic security and to avoid direct military clashes. That is why they have agreed to hold disarmament talks. But the rivalry of the superpowers will, in our view, undergo a long-term evolution. Hence the arms race and the disarmament talks between Moscow and Washington will be with us for a long time to come.

Arms Race: The Dynamics

The arms race has intensified steadily since the end of World War II as both countries have increased their military strength to

back up their pursuit of world domination. Although each gives different reasons for its military build-up, both have common motives for engaging in the arms race. It has been clearly shown over the past 40 years that the balance, or imbalance, of military strength represents their relative positions of strength, which in turn determines to a great extent their postures in the struggle for hegemony. Both sides seek to redress the imbalance, each trying to catch up with and overtake the other. Rough military parity and balance of power could preserve the status quo and maintain stability. But the two superpowers do not rest content with mere maintenance of parity. One party inevitably seeks military superiority over the other if its situation at home and abroad improves, especially when it is enjoying a faster rate of economic growth. Then the other party is forced to meet the challenge. As a Chinese saying goes, "a boat goes up when the river rises." Military strategists in the West call this the law of reaction or reflection in the arms race. The Soviet Union and the United States are locked in a vicious circle of action and reaction. Generally speaking, from the end of World War II to the end of the 1960s, it was the US

who set the challenges for the Soviet Union, but in the 1970s the situation was reversed. However, in the 1980s it is again the United States who is setting the pace.

Deep-seated suspicion is another important motive force of the arms race. Both the Soviet Union and the United States accuse each other of posing a grave threat to the other. So both sides have a strong sense of insecurity and claim that they must build up their military strength to safeguard their national security. An independent country has a right to establish its own forces to safeguard the integrity of its territory and its national security. But the term "national security" in the superpowers' vocabulary is taken beyond its proper meaning. Undoubtedly, each considers the other a major threat to itself and uses the threat as the excuse for a huge military budget. For the past few years a monograph called "The Military Strength of the Soviet Union" has been published annually in the US to serve as the grounds for mobilizing domestic public opinion and to press Congress to approve a greater military budget. The concept of national security in the US extends to the whole of the Western hemisphere as a sphere of American influence, in which the US plays the role of protector of allied countries. The US also wants to "protect" vast regions of developing countries. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, was at first kept within the bounds of its native territory and Eastern Europe until the mid-1950s. But with the rapid increase in its military strength, and as it became more ambitious, the Soviet Union began to pursue a policy of hegemony, justified by such ideas as those of "the socialist community," "limited sovereignty," and "the natural ally of the non-aligned countries," which served as pretexts for Soviet expansion.

A further motive force of the arms race is the relation, both in the US and the USSR, between science and technology and the defence industry, in which each promotes the other. In the allocation of funds, materials, equipment and experts, priority is given to the defence industry. The development of advanced weapons stimulates the progress of science and technology. In turn, by applying the new achievements of science and technology to the defence industry the arms race is raised to a higher level. Since the 1970s the rapid advance of science and technology has shifted the emphasis from quantity to quality, both sides vying to develop a new generation of strategic offensive weapons with multiple-warheads and intercontinental ballistic missiles of small size, high precision and flexible mobility. The Soviets also started in the late 1950s and the Americans in the 1960s to develop strategic defensive weapons, but progress was slow as the technological barriers were too numerous to break through. The Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) programme initiated by President Ronald Reagan is the inevitable outcome of the rapid progress of high technology.

New Round of Arms Race

Starting with the early 80's, the arms race between the superpowers has witnessed a shift from a strategy of nuclear offensive to one of both offensive and defensive.

The Reagan Administration has been pursuing a strategy of non-flexible response aimed at meeting the challenge of Soviet military growth. According to the US Secretary of Defense Caspar W. Weinberger's annual report to Congress for the fiscal year 1987. "This administration has promoted the search for competitive strategies at every level in our

defence programme. Competitive strategies capitalize on our long-term strengths in ways that exploit Soviet long-term weakness. The hallmark of this Administration's defense programme in the second term will be the search to identify and implement competitive strategies for deterrence." The US SDI programme challenges the Soviet Union to a new round of over-all military competition. The US hopes to be the first country to establish its own strategic defence system and hence render the Soviet offensive strategic weapons obsolete.

Since Mikhail Gorbachev came to power, the Soviet Union has made a reappraisal of its domestic and international positions and has made the necessary adjustments in its foreign policy. It has adopted a so-called "accelerated development strategy" to rebuild the Soviet economy and to close the gap with the United States. Therefore it has decided that the development of its national defence must be subordinated to that of the national economy as a whole. With this in mind Moscow is trying its utmost to prevent the SDI programme from materializing in arms control talks with Washington. However, realizing that the SDI programme is not a bargaining chip, the Soviet Union is now being forced to meet the US challenge. According to the action and reaction formula, the two superpowers will continue to engage in an all-round arms race, but now centred on the struggle for superiority in space.

With regard to the SDI programme, it is thought that certain aspects of it are feasible, as it is based on long-term research into new and sophisticated science and technology. The US government is in a position to finance SDI in its initial stages, and on the political front supporters inside the US outnumber its opponents, while the number of the US's allies opposed to it is

decreasing. Progress has already been made on one item of the programme, but there are many technical problems to be overcome if the US is to build an effective defence system that could stand the test of time. Moreover, there still exists a strong force inside the US opposed to the SDI plan. Recently the US Senate issued a report questioning its feasibility. The implementation of the SDI plan would also be prohibitively expensive. It is estimated the research costs will hit 90 billion dollars by the mid-nineties. In its efforts to reach a balanced budget by the 1990s, the US Congress will place many obstacles in the way of SDI.

The Soviet Union is countering the SDI programme by vigorously developing its own defence system. There are over 10,000 Soviet scientists and engineers engaged in research work on sophisticated weapons. The Soviet Union has achieved parity with the United States in particle beam weapons, and in high energy laser weaponry it has the edge, but in advance computer technology it lags behind the United States 10 to 15 years. In the development of a comprehensive space defence system, the US therefore enjoys a definite advantage over the Soviet Union. Notwithstanding all this, neither the United States nor the Soviet Union could build an over-all defence system by the end of the 20th century. Nuclear deterrence will remain effective for a long time to come.

The early nineties will be critical for both the Soviet Union and the United States, when a new generation of nuclear weapons are to replace existing ones. The deployment of US MX, Midgetman and Trident strategic nuclear missiles will be completed by the end of this decade. Without an arms reduction agreement, 572 INF's will be deployed in 1988. On the Soviet side, a fifth generation of ICBM's, SS-24's, SS-25's and a

new type of strategic bomber will be operational. The number of SS-20's will be further increased.

According to a US news report, the Soviet Union is embarking on large-scale nuclear expansion. Without a nuclear limitation agreement, the number of Soviet nuclear warheads could increase from the present 10,000 to 30,000 by the early nineties, and the number of ground-launched missiles from 6,000 to 22,000 by 1995. All this will undoubtedly damage US-Soviet relations and increase political tension between them.

However, for the time being and in the foreseeable future, neither superpower can break the balance of strategic forces and neither dare take the risk of launching war. And more significantly, the forces for peace in the world are growing stronger and stronger, and we are confident that world peace can be won through the concerted efforts of all peace-loving people the world over.

/13104

CSO: 5200/4075

RELATED ISSUES

PRC COMMENTARIES ON DISARMAMENT 'STRUGGLE'

International Disarmament Situation

HK120701 Hong Kong LIAOWANG OVERSEAS EDITION in Chinese No 36, 8 Sep 86
pp 26-27

[Article by Li Ginzhen and Li Gingong: "The Choice Between 'Swords' and 'Plowshares' — Commenting on and Analyzing the Current International Disarmament Situation"]

[Excerpts] In today's world, people are facing this choice: should they continue to build up military forces or beat the swords into a plowshares? Although some people still indulge in arms expansion and war preparations, as a general trend of mankind most people in the world are eager for peace and economic development. The forces demanding reductions in armaments and beating swords into plowshares have been growing and holding back the outbreak of war. The present international disarmament struggle precisely represents this general trend, and has become the main theme of the "International Year of peace."

The present disarmament struggle is mainly reflected in two aspects. First, both the United States and the Soviet Union are trying to contain the opposite side through disarmament negotiations on the basis of their own strength and to build up their own military strength to gain superiority. [passage omitted]

Second, most countries in the world, especially the Third World countries, demand that the superpowers stop their arms race and take the lead in substantially reducing armaments. The East European and West European countries, which are situated in the forefront of the East-West confrontation, feel deeply that the protracted and escalating arms race is directly threatening their security interests, so they demand that the United States and the Soviet Union conclude a disarmament agreement as quickly as possible and substantially reduce their nuclear weapons, ban chemical weapons, and reduce their troops stationed in central Europe. The Third World countries not only are deeply upset by the U.S.-Soviet arms race, but are also worried that the increasing military presence of the United States and the Soviet Union in various regions and the intensifying regional contention between the two superpowers will more seriously threaten their national security and economic development. Therefore, they strongly demand that while reducing their armaments, the United States and the Soviet Union also stop their regional contention and ease regional tensions. Their demand for disarmament is sincere and urgent, and their ardent pursuit of peace and development has formed a strong force which holds back the outbreak of war and maintains peace.

In general, the present disarmament struggle is being carried out through bilateral or multilateral talks with the following main characteristics:

The disarmament proposals are more concrete. This point is obviously reflected in the U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks. The two countries are the main participants in the bilateral talks, and they respectively represent the interests of the two major military blocs in the East and West. The strategic purpose of the United States is to check the momentum of the Soviet Union's nuclear arms expansion and to force the Soviets to substantially reduce its strategic nuclear warheads and dismantle its SS-20 missiles deployed in Europe and Asia. Meanwhile, the Reagan administration is trying to create a "peaceloving image" by giving wide publicity to these proposals domestically to consolidate the Republican Party's position in the 1986 midterm elections and the 1988 presidential election. [paragraph continues]

The strategic purpose of the Soviet Union is to get rid of Reagan's "strategic defensive initiative" and to lighten the heavy economic burden caused by the arms race with the United States and to create better conditions for developing its economy. This may enable the Soviets to carry out rivalry with the Americans on a longer-term basis. [passage omitted]

The disarmament struggle has become more internationalized. At present, the European Disarmament Conference, attended by more than 30 countries, and the multilateral disarmament talks in Geneva have attracted attention from more and more people. The nonaligned and neutral countries participating in these talks and China are becoming more and more influential in international affairs, so the multilateral disarmament talks have also achieved a higher status in the world. Although the United States and the Soviet Union impose their bilateral disputes on the multilateral disarmament talks and thus cast an ominous shadow on these talks, most participants still make full use of this arena to expose the deceptive behavior and false disarmament of the two superpowers, to publicize their own opinions, and to exert pressure on the superpowers. As a participant in the Geneva disarmament talks, China clearly declares that she agrees with all-round prohibition and thorough dismantling of nuclear weapons, opposes the arms race in any form, with any content, and in any area, and calls for reducing conventional armaments and chemical weapons. China's principled position has been widely praised and welcomed.

At the present disarmament talks, people's attention is focused on strategic nuclear weapons, intermediate-range nuclear weapons, space weapons, and conventional weapons. People of good will have good desire and always hope that these issues will be solved at an earlier date but reality only makes them worry. [passage omitted]

To sum up, the bilateral disarmament talks between the United States and the Soviet Union and between the two major military blocs and the multilateral disarmament conference involving many countries are pushed by the forces seeking peace and opposing war and are advancing. All disarmament proposals and actions complying with the general trend of history will be welcomed. However, we must also notice that factors which obstruct the development of disarmament still exist, and the disarmament struggle will be more complicated, arduous, and prolonged. This not only requires the forces for peace in the world make unremitting efforts, but also requires the superpowers to take concrete action to advance disarmament.

Commentary Advocates Conventional Disarmament

OW161040 Beijing in English to North America 0000 GMT 12 Sep 86

[Chen Guang commentary]

[Text] The unprecedented disaster of a nuclear war could wipe out humanity almost instantly, or freeze and starve it into extinction over months of an endless nuclear winter. There is no doubt that nuclear weapons must be reduced and finally eliminated. Destruction by conventional weapons can also be awesome. World War II was a conventional war until the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Deaths and injured still amounted to about 19 million, and the cost of the war, loss of property, and military expenditures topped 5 trillion U.S. dollars.

The conventional weapons now in the hands of the two superpowers are far more powerful than those used in World War II. A cannon's range in the 1940's was 10 km at most, whereas today's artillery can reach four or five times that far. A tactical missile can hit a target as far away as 1,800 km. Accuracy has also taken a quantum leap. Destroying a tank nowadays takes only one or two laser-guided rockets. The destructive power of one salvo from a 12-barrel rocket launcher can equal that of a small nuclear bomb.

Modern weapons have increased the cruelty of conventional war. In the 40 years since World War II 150 local wars and armed conflicts around the world have killed 21 million people, double the number of deaths in World War I and half those in World War II. The Vietnam war alone left 2 million people dead, 20 million wounded, and 17 million homeless. This amounts to one-third of Indochina's total population. Tens of thousands of Afghans have been killed or wounded since the Soviet invasion in 1979. The Soviets have paid a high price for this mayhem. Soviet casualties total perhaps 40,000 deaths and injured, and the financial cost of Moscow's war is estimated at the equivalent of 2 billion U.S. dollars.

Conventional war poses a more realistic threat to the human race than a nuclear one. The frequency of the conventional wars means a risk of staggering death tolls. A conventional war also carries the very real possibility it will escalate into a nuclear war if the two superpowers or other nuclear armed countries become involved. We must reduce nuclear armaments, but we must not ignore the need to do the same to conventional ones. Weapons of all kinds hold peace hostage as long as they exist.

/9738

CSO: 5200/4077-4078

- END -